National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XXI. NO. 36. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 19, 1861. WHOLE NO. 1,076.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,

AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM,

BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

At Its Office, No. 5 Beekman Street, New York,

AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE

PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

107 *N. Fifth St., above Arch, Philadelphia.*

Letters for publication, or relating in any way to the editorial conduct of the paper, should be addressed, "EDITOR OF THE NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD, NEW YORK."

Letters enclosing subscriptions, or relating in any way to the business affairs of the paper, should be addressed, "PUBLISHER OF THE NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD, NEW YORK."

ADVERTISEMENTS, 10 cents per line each insertion.

Pro-Slavery.

In this Department we give place to such extracts from the Pro-Slavery Press, North and South, as serve best to illustrate the character of Slavery and the spirit of its champions and apologists.

ATHEISM TAUGHT FOR CHRISTIANITY!

A DEFENCE OF SLAVERY FROM A NORTHERN PULPIT.

What! preach and kidnap men!
Give thanks, and rob Thy own afflicted poor?
Talk of Thy glorious liberty, and then
Bolt hard the captive's door?

Pilate and Herod friends!
Chief priests and rulers, as of old, combine!
Just God and holy! is that Church, which lends
Strength to the spoiler, Thine?—WHITTIER.

My brain took fire: "Is this," I cried, "the end of prayer and preaching?
Then down with pulpit, down with priest, and give us Nature's teaching!
Foul shame be on ye all, who turn the good to evil,
And steal the Bible from the Lord, to give it to the Devil!
Than garbled text, or parchment law, I own a statute higher,
And God is true, though every book and every man's a liar!"—IBID.

WE have before us a Sermon, entitled, "*The Character and Influence of Abolitionism*," preached on Sunday, Dec. 9th, 1860, by the Rev. HENRY J. VAN DYKE, Pastor of the First Presbyterian (Old School) Church in Brooklyn, N. Y. It has been published not only in pamphlet form but in many influential pro-slavery journals, and is regarded by the enemies of Abolitionism as a triumphant vindication of their principles on Bible grounds. Mr. Van Dyke, probably, is not inferior in standing and influence to any minister of the Old School Presbyterian Church. We may regard his sermon, therefore, as an illustration of the popular Christianity of the United States—the Christianity for rejecting which Abolitionists are denounced as infidels. We shall therefore treat our readers to liberal extracts.

Mr. Van Dyke takes for his text 1 Timothy vi. 1-5, and opens thus:

I propose to discuss the character and influence of Abolitionism. With this view, I have selected a text from the Bible, and purpose to adhere to the letter and spirit of its teaching. We acknowledge, in this place, but one standard of morals—but one authoritative and infallible rule of faith and practice; for we are Christians here; not blind devotees, to bow down to the dictation of any man or Church; not heathen philosophers, to grope our way by the feeble glimmerings of the light of nature; not modern infidels, to appeal from the written law of God to the corrupt and fickle tribunal of reason and humanity; but Christians, on whose banner is inscribed this sublime challenge: "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

Having quoted Rev. Albert Barnes, Dr. McKnight, Dr. Adam Clarke, Dr. Doddridge, Olshausen, and Dr. Gill to support his exposition of the text—an exposition which gives to slavery the sanction of Christianity—he proceeds:

The text, as thus expounded by the concurrent testimony of all the commentators, is a prophecy written for these days, and wonderfully applicable to our present circumstances. It gives us a life-like picture of Abolitionism in its principles, its spirit, and its practice, and furnishes us plain instruction in regard to our duty in the premises. Before entering upon the discussion of the doctrine, let us define the terms employed. By Abolitionism, we mean the principles and measures of Abolitionists. And what is an Abolitionist? He is one who believes that slaveholding is sin, and ought therefore to be abolished. This is the fundamental, the characteristic, the essential principle of Abolitionism—that slaveholding is sin—that holding men in involuntary servitude is an infringement upon the rights of man, a heinous crime in the sight of God. A man may believe, on political or commercial grounds, that slavery is an undesirable system, and that slave labor is not the most profitable; he may have various views as to the rights of slaveholders under the Constitution of the country; he may think this or that law upon the statute books of the Southern States is wrong; but this does not constitute him an Abolitionist; to be entitled to this name, he must believe *that slaveholding is morally wrong*. The alleged sinfulness of slaveholding, as it is the characteristic doctrine, so it is the strength of Abolitionism in all its ramified and various forms. It is by this doctrine that it lays hold upon the hearts and consciences of men, that it comes as a disturbing force into our ecclesiastical and civil institutions, and by exciting religious animosty (which all history proves to be the strongest of human passions), imparts a peculiar intensity to every contest into which it enters. *And you will perceive it is just here that Abolitionism presents a proper subject for discussion in the pulpit: for it is one great purpose of the Bible, and therefore one great duty of God's ministers in its exposition, to show what is sin and what is not.*

Those who hold the doctrine that slaveholding is sin, and ought therefore to be abolished, differ very much in the extent to which they reduce their theory to practice. In some this faith is almost without works. They content themselves with only voting in such a way as in their judgment will best promote the ultimate triumph of their views. Others stand off at what they suppose a safe distance, as Shimei did when he stood on the opposite hill to curse King David, and rebuke the sin, and denounce Divine judgments upon the sinner. Others, more practical, if not more prudent, go into the very midst of the alleged wickedness, and teach "servants under the yoke" that they ought not to count their own masters worthy of all honor—that liberty is their inalienable right—which they should maintain, if necessary, even by the shedding of blood. Now, it is not for me to decide who, of all these, are the truest to their own principles. It is not for me to decide whether the man who preaches this doctrine in brave words, amid applauding multitudes in the city of Brooklyn, or the one who, in the stillness of the night, and in the face of the law's terrors, goes to practise the preaching at Harper's Ferry, is the most consistent Abolitionist, and the most heroic man. It is not for me to decide which is the most important part of a tree; and if the tree be poisonous, which is the most injurious, the root, or the branches, or the fruit. But I am here to-night, in God's name, and by His help, to show that this tree of Abolitionism is evil, and only evil—root and branch, flower, and leaf, and fruit; that it springs from, and is nourished by, an utter rejection of the Scriptures; that it produces no real benefit to the enslaved, and is the fruitful source of division and strife, and infidelity, in both Church and State. I have four distinct propositions on the subject to maintain—four theses to nail up over this pulpit, and defend with the "word of God, which is the sword of the Spirit."

1. Abolitionism has no foundation in the Scriptures.
2. Its principles have been promulgated chiefly by misrepresentation and abuse.
3. It leads, in multitudes of cases, and by a logical process, to utter infidelity.
4. It is the chief cause of the strife that agitates, and the danger that threatens, our country.

In support of his first proposition, Mr. Van Dyke appeals "to the tribunal of that law which God promulgated, amid the solemnities of Sinai," to "that peculiar people for whose institutions he has assumed the responsibility." He quotes Lev. xxv. 44-46: "Both thy bondmen and thy bondmaids which thou shalt have shall be of the heathen that are round about you. Of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids. Moreover, of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you—of them shall ye buy and of their families that are with you, which they beget in your land; and they shall be your *possession*. And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to *inherit them for a possession*; they shall be *your bondmen forever*." Mr. Van Dyke proceeds:

There it is, plainly written in the Divine law. No legislative enactment, no statute framed by legal skill, was ever more explicit and incapable of perversion. When the Abolitionist tells me that slaveholding is sin, in the simplicity of my faith in the Holy Scriptures, I point him to this sacred record, and tell him, in all candor, as my text does, that his teaching blasphemes the name of God and his doctrine. When he begins to dote about questions and strifes of words, appealing to the Declaration of Independence, and asserting that the idea of property in men is an enormity and a crime, I still hold him to the record, saying, "Ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession." When he waxes warm, as he always does if his opponent quote Scripture (which is the great test to try the spirits whether they be of God—the very spear of Ithuriel to reveal their true character)—when he gets angry, and begins to pour out his evil surmisings and abuse upon slaveholders, I obey the precept which says, "from such withdraw thyself," comforting myself with this thought: that the wisdom of God is wiser than men, and the kindness of God kinder than men. Philosophers may reason, and reformers may rave till doomsday; they never can convince me that God, in the Levitical law, or in any other law, sanctioned sin; and as I know, from the plain passage I have quoted, and many more like it, that he *did* sanction slaveholding among his ancient people, I know, also, by the logic of that faith which believes the Bible to be his word, that slaveholding is not sin.

We will quote no further from the Old Testament branch of the argument, but come to Mr. Van Dyke's effort to find a warrant for slavery in the teachings and example of Christ and the Apostles. We have room only for brief extracts.

It is a historic truth, acknowledged on all hands, that at the advent of Jesus Christ slavery existed all over the civilized world, and was intimately interwoven with its social and civil institutions. In Judea, in Asia Minor, in Greece, in all the countries where the Savior or his Apostles preached the gospel, slaveholding was just as common as it is to-day in South Carolina. It is not alleged by any one, or, at least, by any one having any pretensions to scholarship or candor, that the Roman laws regulating slavery were even as mild as the very worst statutes which have been passed upon the subject in modern times. It will not be denied by any honest and well-informed man, that modern civilization and the restraining influences of the gospel, have shed ameliorating influences upon the relation between master and slave, which were utterly unknown at the advent of Christianity. And how did Jesus and his Apostles treat this subject? Masters and slaves met them at every step in their missionary work, and were present in every audience to which they preached. The Roman law, which gave the full power of life and death into the master's hand, was familiar to them; and all the evils connected with the system surrounded them every day, as obviously as the light of heaven. And yet, it is a remarkable fact, which the Abolitionist does not, because he cannot deny, that the New Testament is utterly silent in regard to the alleged sinfulness of slaveholding. In all the instructions of the Savior; in all the reported sermons of the inspired Apostles; in all the epistles they were moved by the Holy Spirit to write, for the instruction of coming generations—there is not one distinct and explicit denunciation of slaveholding, nor one precept requiring the master to emancipate his slaves. Every acknowledged sin is openly and repeatedly condemned, and in unmeasured terms. Drunkenness and adultery, theft and murder—all the moral wrongs which ever have been known to afflict society, are forbidden by name; and yet, according to the teaching of Abolitionism, this greatest of all sins—this sum of all villanies—is never spoken of except in respectful terms. How can this be accounted for?

But the Apostles went much further than to abstain from preaching against slaveholding. *They admitted slaveholders to the communion of the Church.* In our text, masters are acknowledged as "brethren, faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit." If the New Testament is to be received as a faithful history, no man was ever rejected by the Apostolic Church upon the ground that he owned slaves. If he abused his power as a master, if he availed himself of the authority conferred by the Roman law to commit adultery, or murder, or cruelty, he was rejected for these crimes, just as he would be rejected now for similar crimes from any Christian Church in our Southern States.

If parents abused or neglected their children, they were censured, not for having children, but for not treating them properly. And so with the slaveholder. It was not the owning of slaves, but the manner in which he fulfilled the duties of his station, that made him a subject for church discipline. The mere fact that he was a slaveholder no more subjected him to censure, than the mere fact that he was a father or a husband. It is, obviously, upon the recognized lawfulness of the relation, that all the precepts regulating the reciprocal duties of that relation are based.

It is often said that if the Bible does not sanction slaveholding, it does not sanction *American slavery*; that it is not against slaveholding abstractly that the Abolitionist protests, but against the *system of American slavery taken as a whole.*

To this I answer, the Bible does not sanction *American marriage.* The system, taken as a whole, is full of evil and iniquity. The laws of the several States in regard to it, are, many of them, abominable; and the fruits that grow out of it are heart sickening and dreadful. Husbands beat and poison their wives. Multitudes of parents suffer their children to grow up in filth and ignorance; and the details of the divorce cases with which our Northern newspapers have been reeking for months past, are enough to poison the fountains of virtue in every family where they are read. But is any honest man and woman, who live together according to God's ordinance, to be charged with the iniquity of the statute book of Indiana, or the misery and crime of the Five Points? Neither is any honest slaveholder in Virginia to be charged with all the alleged or real evils connected with the system of slavery. And how will you correct the evils connected with marriage? By railing at the whole system as an iniquity? By joining the advocates of Woman's Rights, in their crusade against the divine law upon the subject? By denouncing the relation itself as sinful? No! You acknowledge the relation as lawful, and seek to throw around it, and into the hearts of those who sustain it, the sanctifying influences of the blessed gospel. Just so, Christian men and ministers are striving to remove the evils connected with slavery in our Southern States. The gospel does not sanction either the *system* of American marriage or the *system* of American slavery (if by system be meant everything connected with the practical workings of the two relations); but then it *did* sanction both marriage and slaveholding under a system of laws, and in a condition of public morals, worse than now exist in either New York or Charleston. The apostles did not indorse wicked laws in regard to slavery: they gave both master and slave the law of Christ. They did not sanction licentiousness or cruelty in any social relation; but sought to throw over all the sweet and sanctifying influences of the truth as it is in Jesus.

We pass to Mr. Van Dyke's allegations in support of his second proposition, quoting as much as our space will allow:

Abolitionism is abusive in its persistent misrepresentation of the legal principles involved in the relation between master and slave. Its teachers reiterate, in a thousand exciting forms, the assertion that the idea of property in man blots out his manhood, and degrades him to the level of a brute or a stone. "Domestic slavery," says Dr. Wayland, in his work on Moral Science, "supposes, at best, that the relation between master and slave is not that which exists between man and man, but is a modification, at least, of that which exists between man and the brutes." Do not these Abolitionist philosophers know that, according to the laws of every civilized country on earth, a man has property in his children, and a woman has property in her husband? The statutes of the State of New York, and of every other Northern State, recognize and protect this property, and our courts of justice have repeatedly assessed its value. If a man is killed on a railroad, his wife may bring suit, and recover damages for the pecuniary loss she has sustained. If one man entice away the daughter of another, and marry her, while she is still under age, the father may bring a civil suit for damages for the loss of that child's services, and the pecuniary compensation is the only redress the law provides. Thus the common law of Christendom, and the statutes of our own State, recognize property in man. In what does that property consist? Simply *in such services as a man or a child may properly be required to render.* This is all that the Levitical law, or any other law, means when it says, "Your bondmen shall be your possession, or property, and an inheritance for your children." The property consists, not in the right to treat the slave like a brute, but simply in a legal claim for such services as a man in that position may properly be required to render. And yet Abolitionists, in the face of the divine law, persist in denouncing the very relation between master and slave "as a modification, at least, of that which exists between man and the brutes."

This, however, is not the worst or most prevalent form which their abusive spirit assumes. Their mode of arguing the question of slaveholding, by a pretended appeal to facts, is a tissue of misrepresentation from beginning to end. Let me illustrate my meaning by a parallel case. Suppose I undertake to prove the wickedness of marriage, as it exists in the city of New York. In this discussion suppose the Bible is excluded, or, at least, that it is not recognized as having exclusive jurisdiction in the decision of the question. My first appeal is to the statute law of the State.

I show there enactments which nullify the law of God, and make divorce a marketable and cheap commodity. I collect the advertisements of your daily papers, in which lawyers offer to procure the legal separation of man and wife for a stipulated price, to say nothing, in this sacred place, of other advertisements which decency forbids me to quote. Then I turn to the records of our criminal courts, and find that every day some cruel husband beats his wife, or some unnatural parent murders his child, or some discontented wife or husband seeks the dissolution of the marriage bond. In the next place, I turn to the orphan asylums and hospitals, and show there the miserable wrecks of domestic tyranny in wives deserted and children maimed by drunken parents. In the last place, I go through our streets, and into our tenement houses, and count the thousands of ragged children who, amid ignorance and filth, are training for the prison and gallows.

Summing all these facts together, I put them forth as the fruits of marriage in the city of New York, and a proof that the relation itself is sinful. If I were a novelist, and had written a book to illustrate this same doctrine, I would call this array of facts a "Key." In this key I say nothing about the sweet charities and affections that flourish in ten thousand homes, not a word about the multitude of loving-kindnesses that characterize the daily life of honest people, about the instruction and discipline that are training children at ten thousand firesides for usefulness here and for glory hereafter: all this I ignore, and quote only the statute book, the newspapers, the records of criminal courts, and the miseries of the abodes of poverty. Now, what have I done? I have not misstated or exaggerated a single fact. And yet, am I not a falsifier and a slanderer of the deepest dye? Is there a virtuous woman or an honest man in this city, whose cheeks would not burn with indignation at my one-sided and injurious statements? But this is just what abolitionism has done in regard to slaveholding. It has undertaken to illustrate its cardinal doctrine in works of fiction; and then, to sustain the creation of its fancy, has attempted to underpin it with an accumulation of facts. These facts are collected in precisely the way I have described. The statute books of slaveholding States are searched, and every wrong enactment collated, newspaper reports of cruelty and crime on the part of wicked masters are treasured up and classified, all the outrages that have been perpetrated "by lewd fellows of the baser sort"—of whom there are plenty, both North and South—are eagerly seized and recorded; and this mass of vileness and filth, collected chiefly from the kennels and sewers of society, is put forth as a faithful exhibition of slaveholding. Senators in the forum, and ministers in the pulpit, distil this raw material into the more refined slander, "that Southern society is essentially barbarous, and that slaveholding had its origin in hell." Legislative bodies enact and reënact statutes which declare that slaveholding is such an enormous crime that, if a Southern man, under the broad shield of the Constitution, and with the decisions of the Supreme Court of the country in his hand, shall come within their jurisdiction, and set up a claim to a fugitive slave, he shall be punished with a fine of $2,000 and fifteen years' imprisonment. And this method of argument has continued until multitudes of honest Christian people, in this and other lands, believe that slaveholding is the sin of sins, the sum of all villanies.

We need not go to foreign lands for proof that abolitionism has carried on its warfare by the language of abuse. The annual meeting of the American Anti-slavery Society brings the evidence to our doors. We have been accustomed to laugh at these vernal exhibitions of fanaticism, not thinking, perhaps, that what was fun for us was working death to our brethren, whose property and reputation we are bound to protect. The fact is, we have suffered a fire to be built in our midst, whose sparks have been scattered far and wide; and now, when the smoke of the conflagration comes back to blind our eyes, and the heat of it begins to scorch our industrial and commercial interests, it will not do for us to say that the utterances of that society are the ravings of a fanatical and insignificant few; for the men who compose it are honored in our midst with titles and offices. *Its President is a Chief Justice of the State of New Jersey* (!!!). The ministers who have thrown over its doings the sanction of our holy religion, are quoted and magnified over the land as the representative men of the age; and the man who stood up in its deliberations in the year 1852, and exhausted the vocabulary of abuse upon the compromise measures, and the great statesmen who framed them, is now a judge in our courts and the guardian of our lives and property.

I trust and pray, and call upon you to unite with me in the supplication, that God would give Abolitionists repentance and a better mind, so that in time to come they may, at least, propagate their principles in decent and respectful language.

In support of his third proposition (that Abolitionism leads to Infidelity), Mr. Van Dyke says:

On this point I would not, and will not, be misunderstood. I do not say that Abolitionism is infidelity. I speak only of the tendencies of the system, as indicated in its avowed principles and demonstrated in its practical fruits.

One of its avowed principles is, that it does not try slavery by the Bible; but, as one of its leading advocates has recently declared, it tries the Bible by the principles of freedom. It insists that the Word of God must be made to support certain human opinions, or forfeit all claims upon our faith. That I may not be suspected of exaggeration on this point, let me quote, from the recent work of Mr. Barnes, a passage which may well arrest the attention of all thinking men:

"There are great principles in our nature, as God has made us, which can never be set aside by any authority of a professed revelation. If a book claiming to be a revelation from God, by any fair interpretation, defended slavery, or placed it on the same basis as the relation of husband and wife, parent and child, guardian and ward, such a book would not, and could not, be received by the mass of mankind as a Divine revelation."—*Barnes on Slavery and the Church*, p. 193.

This assumption, that men are capable of judging beforehand what is to be expected in a Divine revelation, is the cockatrice's egg from which, in all ages, heresies have been hatched. This is the spider's web which men have spun out of their own brains, and clinging to which, they have attempted to swing over the yawning abyss of infidelity. Alas, how many have fallen in, and been dashed to pieces! When a man sets up the great principles of our nature (by which he always means his own preconceived opinions) as the supreme tribunal before which even the law of God must be tried—when a man says, "The Bible must teach Abolitionism, or I will not receive it," he has already cut loose from the sheet anchor of faith. True belief says, "Speak, Lord, thy servant waits to hear." Abolitionism says, "Speak, Lord, but speak in accordance with the principles of human nature, or thy word cannot be received by the great mass of mankind as a Divine revelation." The fruit of such principles is just what we might expect. Wherever the seed of Abolitionism has been sown broadcast, a plentiful crop of infidelity has sprung up. In the communities where anti-slavery excitement has been most prevalent, the power of the gospel has invariably declined; and when the tide of fanaticism begins to subside, the wrecks of Church order and of Christian character have been scattered on the shore. I mean no disrespect to New England—to the good men who there stand by the ancient landmarks, and contend earnestly for the truth—nor to the illustrious dead whose praise is in all the Churches; but who does not know that the States in which Abolitionism has achieved its most signal triumphs, are at the same time the great strongholds of infidelity in the land? I have often thought that if some of those old pilgrim fathers could come back, in the spirit and power of Elias, to attend a grand celebration at Plymouth rock, they might well preach on this text: "If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham." The effect of Abolitionism upon individuals, is no less striking and mournful than its influence upon communities. It is a remarkable and instructive fact, and one at which Christian men would do well to pause and consider, that, in this country, all the prominent leaders of Abolitionism, outside of the ministry, have become avowed infidels; and that all our notorious Abolition preachers have renounced the great doctrines of grace as they are taught in the standards of the reformed Churches—have resorted to the most violent processes of interpretation to avoid the obvious meaning of plain Scriptural texts, and ascribed to the apostles of Christ principles from which piety and moral courage instinctively revolt. They make that to be sin which the Bible does not declare to be sin. They denounce, in language such as the sternest prophets of the law never employed, a relation which Jesus and his Apostles recognized and regulated. They seek to institute terms and tests of Christian communion utterly at variance with the organic law of the Church, as founded by its Divine Head; and, attempting to justify this usurpation of Divine prerogatives by an appeal from God's law to the dictates of fallen human nature, they would set up a spiritual tyranny more odious and insufferable, because more arbitrary and uncertain in its decisions, than Popery itself. And as the tree is, so have its fruits been. It is not a theory, but a demonstrated fact, that Abolitionism leads to infidelity. Such men as Garrison, and Giddings, and Gerrit Smith, have yielded to the current of their own principles, and thrown the Bible overboard. Thousands of humbler men who listen to Abolition preachers, will go and do likewise. And whether it be the restraints of official position, or the preventing grace of God, that enables such preachers to row up the stream and regard the authority of Scripture in other matters, their influence upon this one subject is all the more pernicious, because they prophesy in the name of Christ. In this sincere and plain utterance of my deep convictions, I am only discharging my conscience toward the flock over which I am set. When the shepherd seeth the wolf coming, he is bound to give warning.

Since Abolitionists glory in the fact that the present agitation of the slavery question is, primarily, the result of their efforts, it is not worth while to occupy our precious space with Mr. Van Dyke's arguments in support of his fourth proposition. To such preachers how appropriate the burning words of Whittier:

"Woe to the priesthood! woe
To those whose hire is with the price of blood—
Perverting, darkening, changing as they go,
The searching truths of God!

Their glory and their might
Shall perish; and their very names shall be
Vile before all the people, in the light
Of the world's liberty."

LETTER FROM REV. H. J. VAN DYKE.

From The Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle.

WE have been permitted to copy the subjoined letter from the Rev. H. J. Van Dyke to a clergyman of this city. Mr. Van Dyke is the author of a sermon in defence of the South and her institutions, which has been extensively circulated and admired throughout the country. His letter breathes the same patriotic and fraternal spirit:

BROOKLYN, N. Y., Dec. 20, 1860.

Your letter of the 17th ult. gives me both pleasure and pain—pleasure because amid the fierce agitations of the times, and the unnatural alienation which has grown up between North and South, we may still call each other brethren, and sympathise with each other in efforts to defend "the name of God and his doctrine," and yet pain, inexpressible pain, to hear you speak of a dissolution of our national Union, as a foregone conclusion. If, in the light of history, I could see any reasonable hope of a peaceful separation, though even then I would grieve to see the failure of this most successful effort at free government the world ever saw, still I could submit with comparative composure. But be assured that disunion will be the signal for disintegration and war—not merely between North and South, but in the very heart of Northern States. Is it right for our Southern brethren to precipitate us, who still love them, upon this fearful conflict? Do the facts in the case warrant and necessitate the dissolution of our Union? Is there no other remedy? It is true, abolitionism seems to have gained a political triumph; but I tell you, if our Southern friends *will only stand by us as we have stood by them*, it is a triumph which will soon be their ruin; "pride goeth before destruction." The party with which Abolitionists have coöperated, and whose success they now appropriate, will *throw them off*. And now that the election is past, and Christian men and ministers can speak out without the fear or suspicion of a partisan purpose, such doctrine as I have endeavored to expound in my sermon will "have free course and be glorified." The amazing excitement which that sermon has produced, and the fervor with which it has been received, even in New England, only shows that the public mind was prepared for it. The party now in power, and which, it must be confessed, derived its chief strength from abolitionism, succeeded not because it really has a majority, but because its opponents were unhappily divided. There are three millions of voters in the Northern States opposed to abolitionism and all its allies. New York alone has a majority of fifty thousand—if the election were taken over again, it would be one hundred thousand on the conservative side.

With these facts staring them in the face, cannot the South afford to "wait a little longer"? Must Christian men and Christian ministers who, whether North or South, are the salt of the earth, throw their influence into the rising tide of revolution—a revolution which, if it shall be consummated, will rend asunder all the religious as well as the governmental institutions of the land? Our beloved and glorious Church, which has stood up, under God, as a great bulwark to breast the tide of fanaticism, cannot long withstand the shriek of disunion.

You and I will not long have the privilege of meeting as we did in the General Assembly of 1859, feeling that we are sitting together under the shadow of a vine which "sends out her boughs unto the sea, and her branches unto the river." All our great ecclesiastical schemes for the evangelization of the land must wither and languish in the heat of this unnatural contest. Suffer me to beg you, and, through you, any one who may regard a voice so feeble as mine, to reconsider this matter. I say freely that unless the hostile legislation of Northern States is repealed, and the violent and unchristian agitation of the slavery question put down, your State and all the Southern States *ought to break loose from a government that will not protect their rights, and from a people who disregard the plainest obligations of consanguinity and brotherhood.* But then, I believe, before God, that if we can only have more time, even-handed justice will soon commend to its own lips this poisoned cup which abolitionism has mingled for you. These religious demagogues have had their day. "The prosperity of fools will destroy them." Tell your friends this, as the testimony of a man born in Pennsylvania, brought up in Northern air, and now settled and sustained in the ministry of God's grace and the favor of his people in the city of Brooklyn.

I will only add (and I do so from a full heart), that whatever may be the fate of our country, there is a union between such Southern men as you, and such Northern men as I am, which earth and hell can never dissolve, for

I am yours, *in Christ*, HENRY J. VAN DYKE.

THE "CONVENTION" AT ST. JAMES HALL.

From The Buffalo Commercial Advertiser, Jan. 4.

ACCORDING to previous announcement, this Convention met at St. James Hall yesterday afternoon. A very limited number of persons were in attendance, most of whom had been drawn to the place by curiosity. Miss Susan B. Anthony called the meeting to order, after which the Rev. Beriah Green proceeded to deliver an address at some considerable length.

In the evening, an audience very little larger than that in attendance in the afternoon, assembled, among whom were to be noticed several colored men, and a few ladies. Susan, as usual, opened the ball, called the house to order, and introduced Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton. Elizabeth immediately drew her manuscript, and forthwith proceeded to inform those present of the horrible state of things which now and always had existed in the world generally, and in this country particularly. She had derived her first impressions in regard to slavery from a little "nigger gal"; and that little "nigger gal," she, Elizabeth, considered as well posted in regard to the horrors of the peculiar institution, and as well qualified to give an opinion as to its injustice, as the most eminent theologian or jurist. The Fugitive Slave law, of course, was duly "tackled"—Jefferson was accused of very unhandsome things—neither did the Dred Scott decision escape. She avowed that, after all the labor and talent bestowed upon it, the cart had been placed before the horse. Any woman in the house, she thought, could have given a better opinion. She thought it would be best to let South Carolina slide, in which case the rest of us could live harmoniously together after the manner prescribed by her, Elizabeth. The lady continued her address at length, much after the same style, but we have not the space or inclination to follow her. She was listened to with respectful attention, and no inclination to disturb her was manifested.

At the conclusion of her remarks, ex-Justice HINSON arose, and expressed a desire to offer a resolution. Birdseye Wilcox, Esq., objected, and moved that the meeting adjourn, accompanying his motion by some very emphatic remarks. Here followed much confusion, during which Mr. W.'s favorite expression "Augh!" was frequently heard. The ex-justice finally obtained a hearing, and proceeded to take the sense of the meeting as to their approval or disapproval of the sentiments advanced by Mrs. Stanton. Those who coincided with the lady's ideas were requested to "manifest the same by saying aye." An impressive silence followed. Those opposed were desired to say no; and they said "No!" most emphatically, and with almost absolute unanimity. Things here began to assume rather an uproarious look, and Miss Anthony appeared to be getting angry, and attempted to preserve silence, but without much success. Mr. Wilcox wished to be heard; so did Mr. Hinson—neither gentleman seeming to be well posted in regard to parliamentary usages. Tolerable order having been restored, Rev. Beriah Green was introduced. He spoke vehemently for some time, in the course of which he was frequently interrupted by groans, hisses, and applause, and at one time the police were obliged to interfere. Most of the ladies who were present got up to leave, but, at the request of Miss Anthony, several of them resumed their seats.

After Mr. Green had finished, a young gentleman, who was introduced as Geo. W. Taylor, of Erie Co., came forward and attempted to speak, but the confusion was so great that he was obliged to desist. He was called upon by some one for a song, and, making a virtue of necessity, commenced to sing a hymn, in a low, almost inaudible voice. This, however, did not please some dissatisfied persons, who struck up "The Star-spangled Banner," and sang it with such volume as completely to drown the voice of Mr. Taylor.

The confusion here became so great, that Mr. Taylor was no longer heard, and Miss Anthony, after announcing the programme for to-day, and expressing her disgust at the treatment she and her associates had received, declared the Convention adjourned.

Mr. Hinson moved a reorganization of the meeting, and proposed Mr. B. Wilcox as chairman. Mr. Wilcox was elected, and proceeded to mount the stage, where he seated himself with much dignity. He was followed by Mr. Hinson and others, but just as proceedings were about to commence, the person in charge of the hall shut off the gas, and those who were yet in the hall were left in almost total darkness.

We hope never to see the proceedings of last night repeated. To speak of the whole thing in its mildest form, is to say, it was a disgrace. While Susan B. Anthony and her coadjutors have an undoubted right to express their opinions, and that without molestation or hindrance, the policy of holding these miscalled "conventions" is very questionable. We hope, for the credit of the city, that those who were in attendance, and by their inexcusable conduct brought about a miniature pandemonium, will either keep away, or, if they must needs be present, will go prepared to observe the common decencies of life.

Selections.

A VISIT TO CANADA.

THE condition and prospects of the colored people in Canada—many of whom have escaped from slavery in the United States—are, doubtless, interesting to many of our readers. A visit was recently paid to three of the settlements by our friend, Joseph Morris, of Ohio, who has furnished us with some notes of his observations.

His first call was at Chatham, on the river Thames, a flourishing town of about six thousand inhabitants, and the seat of justice for Kent County. The colored people form about one third of the population, and their mercantile establishments, farms, houses, and other improvements, compare favorably with those of their white neighbors. J. M. visited many of them at their own homes, and distributed amongst them a large number of tracts, which were kindly received, and they appeared very fully to appreciate his motives. He was taken, at his request, to the houses of the most indigent among them, but saw no cases of extreme destitution, and none equal to what could be found in our towns.

The next place visited was Buxton, known as the Elgin Association. This is under the care of directors, who make a Report annually. William King, a Presbyterian minister, and his wife reside on the premises, and have the immediate oversight and direction of the little colony. The impressions made upon J. M.'s mind by his examination into the state of the colored people in this settlement, appears to have been very agreeable and encouraging. He never saw any people more willing to rely on their own resources. In common with the inhabitants of many other newly settled districts in the north-west and west, they experienced difficulties in recent seasons, from the failure of crops, but these have been surmounted, and their toil has been again abundantly rewarded.

The last settlement visited by our friend was Shrewsbury, on Lake Erie, north of Cleveland. This is quite new, the people are of course poor, and it is difficult to procure land. J. M. visited some of them in their homes, and gave them tracts, and it was heart-touching to him to witness their emotion of gratitude on learning his object in visiting them. They had generally taken care to furnish themselves with the Holy Scriptures, but there were a few cases of destitution, which will be supplied. J. M. encouraged the spirit of independence which they manifested in respect to obtaining the means of living and educating their children. He thinks the unrestricted enjoyment of the privileges of citizenship largely promotes their improvement.

From this point Joseph Morris returned home, gratified with the results of his investigations, and having reliable accounts of the satisfactory condition of the other settlements.—*Friends' Review.*

HARD TIMES.

AMONG the delusions now prevalent in the extreme South is the notion that the secession of South Carolina has struck general terror into the North, and has produced so terrible a panic that commerce is arrested, labor out of employment, and almost universal starvation desolating our cities. The absurdity of these ignorant misconceptions of the condition of the North, and of the importance of South Carolina in the affairs of the world, is almost too great for serious refutation. If South Carolina, instead of proclaiming herself out of the Union, had sunk, with all her cotton, into the ocean a thousand fathoms deep, her disappearance would have given no very material check to Northern prosperity, and would have produced scarcely any other perceptible effect than the natural horror and pity due to such a catastrophe.

The best evidence of the condition of our laboring class is afforded by the Savings Banks, the deposits in which are made almost wholly from their surplus earnings. From the annual reports which these institutions have just made to the Bank Department at Albany, it appears that the total amount of deposits in the four larger Savings Banks in this city, on January 1, 1861, was $33,294,995, while the aggregate of deposits in the smaller institutions is from $8,000,000 to $10,000,000. From this official statement, it will be seen that the laboring classes of New York City have in bank, subject to their order, in hard cash, not less than $40,000,000. Now, this sum, which is merely the surplus investments of our laborers, over and above what they choose to spend, or to invest in other ways, is actually $4,000,000 more than the entire valuation of the City of Charleston, negroes included, and counted as property at so much a head, and at the prices which prevailed before the present distress there. Only three years ago, in 1857, the Mayor of Charleston stated the population of that city at 60,000, and the entire value of its property of all kinds at $36,127,751. As his estimate of the population was 50 per cent. too high, the recent census having shown that it amounts, including slaves, to only 40,000, it may reasonably be inferred that his estimate of the property also exceeds the truth. But taking Charleston at its highest valuation, the fact is certain that the poor of New York could buy, and pay for in hard cash, the whole place, and have a capital of $4,000,000 left for improvements. They could do it, too, without so much as putting their hands in their pockets.

Not only have our laborers this great amount invested, but they are continually adding to it. The deposits already made during the present month average, in some banks, four times as much as on the corresponding days of last year. The total amount of deposits on January 1, 1857, in the four larger institutions already referred to, was $22,447,393, or nearly $11,000,000 less than the aggregate now on deposit.

In Massachusetts, according to the report of the Bank Commissioners, there are ninety Savings Banks in operation. The amount of money on deposit in these banks November 1, 1860, was $45,054,235—an increase from the previous year of $5,629,817. The laborers of Massachusetts, therefore, with their surplus investments, could buy Charleston, and have more than $9,000,000 to spare.

Contrast these official and authentic evidences of the prosperous condition of the laboring classes at the North, with the statements that reach us by every mail of the distress which the rebellion of the slaveholders has brought on South Carolina. Not only is business at a stand, and external commerce annihilated, and but little money in circulation, but even food is scarce and dear, beef selling at thirty-five cents a pound, and other provisions in proportion. Depending for her supplies of breadstuffs and meat on the west and north-west, with money exhausted and credit ruined, South Carolina, at the very beginning of her mad attempt at independence, finds herself on the brink of ruin. Where will she be when war in earnest comes upon her in all its grim reality?—*The Tribune.*

THE ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION—ANOTHER DISGRACEFUL DISTURBANCE.

From The Buffalo Express.

ST. JAMES HALL was the scene of another tumult last evening, even more disgraceful to our city and more outrageous than that of the night before. We shall not describe it in detail, for we feel too much shame on its account to be willing that more publicity than is necessary should be given to the occurrence. The disturbers of the meeting were more numerous and more rowdyish than on the former occasion, and carried their performances to a length little short of mob rioting.

We care not how obnoxious a meeting may be, there can be no warrant for such proceedings in order to break it up or manifest disapprobation of its objects. None but those whose self-respect is very low, and whose instincts incline to rowdyism, would demean themselves by becoming instigators of, or participants in, any such movement. If decency and common sense (the latter to recognize the folly of persecuting and treating with violence whatever ultraism may be deprecated) cannot suffice for the preservation of order and the right of speech, it is a pity that our laws cannot be made to bear upon disturbers as well as rioters.

The uproar broke out last evening in the greatest violence during the address of Mrs. Stanton. Entire control of the meeting was taken by the disorganizers, who elected, on motion of ex-Justice Hinson, S. H. Addington, Chairman, and John K. Tucker, Vice-President. Of course, it will be understood that Mr. Addington was not of their "crowd." C. C. Bristol was called upon, and proceeded to the platform to speak. At this stage of the proceedings, the uproar being tremendous, Mayor Alberger, who has been ill, unfit to perform any of the energetic functions of his office, appeared and attempted to get a resto

mind of another piece of tardy justice, too long delayed. Mr. Winthrop considers himself ill used by being turned out of the United States Senate in 1851. Mr. Sumner should do what he can to repair this great wrong by resigning, and then Winthrop should have his legitimate position. In fact, places should be forthwith made for all such men. I recommend my friend, Mr. Brodhead, one of the representatives from Mr. Lunt's ward, to take himself out of the way, and let that virtuous citizen have the place for which he has so long and so ardently aspired. I don't exactly see what can be done for Mr. George T. Curtis, the worst injured man of the lot, but perhaps if Judge Bigelow or Judge Hoar should resign, the Governor might be induced to put Curtis on the bench. But why do I talk of Governor Andrew's action? He and Mr. Goodrich should immediately abdicate, and let Lawrence and Marston, or Beach and t'other fellow come in. *The Courier* and *Post* should be made the official organs of the State government, and, if necessary, supported at the public expense. The circulation of all such newspapers ought to be encouraged; this might be done by a stamp duty on all other papers, for their especial benefit. I doubt, however, whether even this would compel the people to read 'em. I might mention various smaller reforms, but they will readily occur when we once get under way. I am not sure but it will be found useful and necessary to abolish the Supreme Court entirely, and enact that the United States slave commissioners shall do our judiciary work for us. Juries are getting to be nuisances, and should be abolished as soon as possible. In 1865, if not before, a Convention should be held to amend the Constitution, so as to establish our whole government on a South Carolina basis. Then we shall be all right. But we cannot do everything. Congress must take hold and help us. Several amendments of the Constitution are needed. Instead of the half-way provision that the President shall be a native of the country, it ought to be stipulated that he shall be a native of a slaveholding State and a holder of slaves. It might be well to provide that no man should be a Senator unless he had served an apprenticeship as an overseer and whipper on a plantation. A large property qualification (say 1,000 slaves) ought to be required for judges of the United States Supreme Court. The skin of a flayed negro might be substituted for the ermine, surplice, or what not, which the venerable grannies now wear. The capital should be removed to Charleston, without delay; that port, with Savannah, Wilmington, Mobile, New Orleans and Galveston should be made the authorized ports of the country; New York, Boston and Philadelphia being closed and blockaded, at least until they change their politics. But I will not bore you further with my programme. You see I go further than Mr. Curtis, Judge Shaw, Mr. Winthrop and Mr. Ashmun, and even beyond Tom Corwin. But half-way measures will do no good; I am satisfied of this. We must go the entire swine, or we shall never have peace and quietness. *The Post* prints Mr. Delano's resolution of inquiry into the subject of reinforcing Fort Moultrie, with this heading, "A Massachusetts man making trouble." This is the right spirit. If any one undertakes to inquire into the condition of the public defences, he should be denounced as a pernicious intermeddler, at once. It may be necessary to resort to tar and feathers if this thing is not stopped.

I shall not give up the Union until Mr. William Appleton leaves Washington, for I see by *The New York Express* that "he will remain there as long as he can be of any service in saving the Union"! The same authority says "he is giving his days and nights to the preservation of the government." I fear his efforts are neutralized by Burlingame's position, but we have reason to hope for great results. I don't think we need to despair so long as Appleton sits up nights, Tom Corwin cracks jokes, and John J. Crittenden sheds tears—all for the Union and the preservation of slavery. When Appleton takes his portmanteau and leaves for Boston, we may know it is "all up."

SPEECH OF HON. WILLIAM H. SEWARD

In the United States Senate, Jan. 12, 1861.

Mr. President: Congress adjourned last summer amid auspices of national abundance, contentment, tranquility and happiness. It was reassembled this winter in the presence of derangement of business, and disturbance of public as well as private credit, and in the face of seditious combinations to overthrow the Union. The alarm is appaling, for Union is not more the body than liberty is the soul of the nation. The American citizen has been accustomed to believe the Republic immortal. He shrinks from the sight of convulsions indicative of its sudden death. The report of our condition has gone over the seas, and we who have so long, and with much complacency, studied the endless agitations of society in the Old World, believing ourselves exempt from such disturbances, now, in our turn, seem to be falling into a momentous and disastrous revolution.

I know how difficult it is to decide, amid so many and so various counsels, what ought to be and what even can be done. Certainly, however, it is time for every Senator to declare himself. I, therefore, following the example of the noble Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Johnson), avow my adherence to the Union in its integrity and with all its parts, with my friends, with my party, with my State, with my country, or without either, as they may determine, in every event, whether of peace or of war, with every consequence of honor or dishonor, of life or death. Although I lament the occasion, I hail with cheerfulness the duty of lifting up my voice among distracted debates, for my whole country and its inestimable Union.

Hitherto, the exhibitions of spirit and resolution here, as elsewhere, have been chiefly made on the side of disunion. I do not regret this. Disunion is so unexpected, and unnatural, that it must plainly reveal itself before its presence can be realized. I like best, also, the courage that rises slowly under the pressure of severe provocation. If it be a Christian duty to forgive to the stranger even seventy times seven offenses, it is the highest patriotism to endure without complaint the passionate waywardness of political brethren so long as there is hope that they may come to a better mind.

I think it is easy to pronounce what measures or conduct will not save the Union. I agree with the honorable Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Clingman), that mere eulogiums will not save it. Yet I think that as prayer brings us nearer to God, though it cannot move him toward us, so there is a healing and saving virtue in every word of devotion to the Union that is spoken, and in every sigh, that its danger draws forth. I know, at least, that, like virtue, it derives strength from every irreverent act that is committed, and every blasphemous phrase that is uttered against it.

The Union cannot be saved by mutual criminations concerning our respective share of responsibility for the present evils. He whose conscience acquits him will naturally be slow to accuse others whose cooperation he needs. History only can adjust the great account.

A continuance of the debate on the constitutional power of Congress over the subject of slavery in the Territories will not save the Union. The opinions of parties and sections on that question have become dogmatical, and it is this circumstance that has produced the existing alienation. A truce, at least during the debate on the Union, is essential to reconciliation.

The Union cannot be saved by proving that secession is illegal or unconstitutional. Persons bent on that fearful step will not stand long enough on forms of law to be dislodged; and loyal men do not need such narrow ground to stand upon.

I fear that little more will be gained from discussing the right of the Federal government to coerce seceding States to obedience. If disunion is to go on, this question will give place to the more practical one, whether many seceding States have a right to coerce the remaining members to acquiesce in a dissolution.

I dread, as in my innermost soul I abhor, civil war. I do not know what the Union would be worth if saved by the use of the sword. Yet, for all this, I do not agree with those who, with a desire to avert that great calamity, advise a conventional or unopposed separation, with a view to what they call a reconstruction. It is enough for me, first, that in this plan, destruction goes before reconstruction: and secondly, that the strength of the vase in which the hopes of the nation are held consists chiefly in its remaining unbroken.

Congressional compromises are not likely to save the Union. I know, indeed, that tradition favors this form of remedy. But it is essential to success, in any case, that there be found a preponderating mass of citizens, so far neutral on the issue which separates parties, that they can intervene, strike down clashing weapons, and compel an accommodation. Moderate concessions are not customarily asked by a force with its guns in battery; nor are liberal concessions apt to be given by an opposing force not less confident of its own right and its own strength. I think, also, that there is a prevailing conviction that legislative compromises which sacrifice honestly-cherished principles, while they anticipate future exigencies, even if they do not assume extra-constitutional powers, are less sure to avert imminent evils than they are certain to produce ultimately even greater dangers.

Indeed, Mr. President, I think it will be wise to discard two prevalent ideas or prejudices, namely: first, that the Union is to be saved by somebody in particular; and secondly, that it is to be saved by some cunning and insincere compact of pacification. If I remember rightly, I said something like this here so long ago as 1850, and afterward in 1854.

The present danger discloses itself in this form. Discontented citizens have obtained political power in certain States, and they are using this authority to overthrow the Federal government. They delude themselves with a belief that the State power they have acquired enables them to discharge themselves of allegiance to the whole Republic. The honorable Senator from Illinois (Mr. Douglas) says we have a right to coerce a State, but we cannot. The President says that no State has a right to secede, but we have no constitutional power to make war against a State. The dilemma results from an assumption that those who, in such a case, act against the Federal government, act lawfully as a State; although manifestly they have perverted the power of the State to an unconstitutional purpose. A class of politicians in New England set up this theory, and attempted to practice upon it in our war with Great Britain. Mr. Jefferson did not hesitate to say that States must be kept within their constitutional sphere by impulsion, if they could not be held there by attraction. Secession was then held to be inadmissible in the face of a public enemy. But, if it is untenable in one case, it is necessarily so in all others. I fully admit the originality, the sovereignty, and the independence of the several States within their sphere. But I hold the Federal government to be equally original, sovereign, and independent within its sphere. And the government of the State can no more absolve the people residing within its limits from allegiance to the Union, than the government of the Union can absolve them from allegiance to the State. The Constitution of the United States, and the laws made in pursuance thereof, are the supreme law of the land, paramount to all legislation of the States, whether made under the Constitution, or by even their organic conventions. The Union can be dissolved, not by secession, with or without armed force, but only by the voluntary consent of the people of the United States, collected in the manner prescribed by the Constitution of the United States.

Congress, in the present case, ought not to be impassive. It ought, if it can, to redress any real grievance of the offended States, and then it ought to supply the President with all the means necessary to maintain the Union in the full exhibition and discreet exercise of its authority. Beyond this, with the proper activity on the part of the Executive, the responsibility of saving the Union belongs to the people, and they are abundantly competent to discharge it.

I propose, therefore, with great deference, to address myself to the country upon the momentous subject, asking a hearing not less from the people what are called the seceding than from those who reside within the adhering States.

Union is an old, fixed, settled habit of the American people, resulting from convictions of its necessity, and therefore not likely to be hastily discarded. The early States, while existing as Colonies, were combined, though imperfectly, through a common allegiance to the British Crown. When that allegiance ceased no one was so presumptuous as to suppose political existence compatible with disunion; and, therefore, on the same day that they declared themselves independent, they proclaimed themselves also confederated States. Experience in war and in peace, from 1776 until 1787, only convinced them of the necessity of converting that loose Confederacy into a more perfect and a perpetual Union. They acted with a coolness very different from the intemperate conduct of those who now, on one side, threaten, and those who, on the other, rashly defy disunion. They considered the continuance of the Union as a subject comprehending nothing less than the safety and welfare of all the parts of which the country was composed, and the fate of an empire in many respects the most interesting in the world. I enter upon the subject of continuing the Union now, deeply impressed with the same generous and loyal conviction. How could it be otherwise, when, instead of only thirteen, the country is now composed of thirty-three parts, and the empire embraces, instead of only four millions, no less than thirty millions of inhabitants?

The founders of the Constitution moreover regarded the Union no mere national or American interest. On the contrary, they confessed with deep sensibility that it seemed to them to have been reserved for the people of this country to decide whether societies of men are really capable of establishing good government upon reflection and choice, or whether they are forever destined to depend for their political constitutions on accident and force. They feared, therefore, that their failure to continue and perfect the Union would be a misfortune to the nations. How much more, sir, would its overthrow be a calamity to mankind!

Some form of government is indispensable here as elsewhere. Whatever form we have, every individual citizen and every State must cede to it some natural rights, to invest the government with the requisite power. The simple question, therefore, for us now to decide, while laying aside all pique, all passion, and prejudice, is, whether it conduces more to the interests of the people of this country to remain for the general purpose of peace and war, commerce inland and foreign, postal communications at home and abroad, the care and disposition of the public domain, colonization, the organization and admission of new States, and, generally, the enlargement of empire, one nation under our present Constitution, than it would be to divide themselves into separate Confederacies or States.

Our country remains now as it was in 1787—composed not of detached and distant Territories, but of one whole well-conducted and fertile region lying within the temperate zone, with climates and soils hardly more various than those of France or of Italy. This slight diversity quickens and amplifies manufacture and commerce. Our rivers and valleys, as improved by art, furnish us a system of highways unequalled in the world. The different forms of labor, if slavery were not perverted to purposes of political ambition, need not constitute an element of strife in the Confederacy.

Notwithstanding recent vehement expressions and manifestations of intolerance in some quarters, produced by intense partisan excitement, we are, in fact, an homogeneous people, chiefly of one stock, with accessions well assimilated. We have, practically, only one language, one religion, and one system of government, and manners and customs common to all. Why, then, shall we not remain henceforth as hitherto, one people?

The first object of every human society is safety or security, for which, if need be, they will, and they must, sacrifice every other. This security is of two kinds: one, exemption from foreign aggression and influence; the other, exemption from domestic tyranny and sedition.

Foreign wars come from either violations of treaties or domestic violence. The Union has, thus far, proved itself an almost perfect shield against such wars. The United States, continually enlarging their diplomatic acquaintance, have now treaties with France, the Netherlands, Great Britain, Sweden, Prussia, Spain, Russia, Denmark, Mexico, Brazil, Austria, Turkey, Chili, Siam, Muscat, Venezuela, Peru, Greece, Sardinia, Ecuador, Hanover, Portugal, New-Granada, Hesse Cassel, Wurtemburg, China, Bavaria, Saxony, Nassau, Switzerland, Mecklenburg-Schwerin, Gautemala, the Hawaiian Islands, San Salvador, Borneo, Costa Rica, Peru, Bremen, the Argentine Confederation, Loo Choo, Japan, Brunswick, Persia, Baden, Belgium, and Paraguay. Nevertheless, the United States, within their entire existence under the Federal Constitution, have had flagrant wars with only four States, two of which were insignificant Powers on the coast of Barbary, and have had direct hostilities, amounting to reprisals, against only two or three more; and they are now at peace with the whole world. If the Union should be divided into only two Confederacies, each of them would need to make as many treaties as we have now; and, of course, would be liable to give as many causes of war as we now do. But we know, from the sad experience of other nations, that disintegration, once begun, inevitably continues until even the greatest empire crumbles into many parts. Each Confederation that shall ultimately arise out of the ruin of the Union will have necessity for as many treaties as we now have, and will incur liabilities for war as often as we now do, by breaking them. It is the multiplication of treaties, and the want of confederation, that makes war the normal condition of society in Western Europe and in Spanish America. It is union that, notwithstanding our world-wide intercourse, makes peace the habit of the American people.

I will not descend so low as to ask whether new Confederacies would be able or willing to bear the grievous expense of maintaining the diplomatic relations which cannot be dispensed with except by withdrawing from foreign commerce.

Our Federal government is better able to avoid giving just causes of war than several Confederacies, because it can conform the action of all the States to compacts. It can have only one construction, and only one tribunal to pronounce that construction, of every treaty. Local and temporary interests and passions, or personal cupidity and ambition can drive small Confederacies or States more easily than a great Republic into indiscreet violations of treaties.

The United States being a great and formidable power, can always secure favorable and satisfactory treaties. Indeed, every treaty we have was voluntarily made. Small Confederacies or States must take such treaties as they can get, and give whatever treaties are exacted. A humiliating, or even an unsatisfactory treaty, is a chronic cause of foreign war.

The chapter of wars resulting from unjustifiable causes would, in case of division, amplify itself in proportion to the number of new Confederacies and their irritability. Our disputes with Great Britain about Oregon, the boundary of Maine, the patriot insurrection in Canada, and the island of San Juan; the border strifes between Texas and Mexico, the incursions of the late William Walker into Mexico and Central America; all these were cases in which war was prevented only by the imperturbability of the Federal government.

This government not only gives fewer causes of war, whether just or unjust, than smaller Confederacies would; but it always has a greater ability to accommodate them by the exercise of more coolness and courage, the use of more various and more liberal means, and the display, if need be, of greater force. Every one knows how placable we ourselves are in controversies with Great Britain, France and Spain; and yet how exacting we have been in our intercourse with New Granada, Paraguay, and San Juan de Nicaragua.

Mr. President, no one will dispute our forefathers' maxim, that the common safety of all is the safety of each of the States. While they remain united, the Federal government combines all the materials and all the forces of the several States; organizes their defences on one general principle; harmonizes and assimilates them with one system; watches for them with a single eye, which it turns in all directions, and moves all agents under the control of one executive head. A nation so constituted is safe against assault or even insult.

War produces always a speedy exhaustion of money and a severe strain upon credit. The treasuries and credits of small confederacies would often prove inadequate. Those of the Union are always ample.

I have thus far kept out of view the relations which must arise between the confederacies themselves. They would be small and inconsiderable nations bordering on each other, and, therefore, according to all political philosophy, natural enemies. In addition to the many treaties which each must make with foreign Powers, and the causes of war which they would give by violating them, each of the confederacies must also maintain treaties with all the others, and so be liable to give them frequent offence. They would necessarily have different interests resulting from their establishment of different policies of revenue, of mining, manufactures and navigation, of immigration, and perhaps the slave trade. Each would stipulate with foreign nations for advantages peculiar to itself and injurious to its rivals.

If, indeed, it were necessary that the Union should be broken up, it would be in the last degree important that the new confederacies to be formed should be as nearly as possible equal in strength and power, that mutual fear and mutual respect might inspire them with caution against mutual offence. But such equality could not long be maintained; one confederacy would rise in the scale of political importance, and the others would view it thenceforward with envy and apprehension. Jealousies would bring on frequent and retaliatory wars, and all these wars, from the peculiar circumstances of the confederacies, would have the nature and character of civil war. Dissolution, therefore, is, for the people of this country, perpetual civil war. To mitigate it, and obtain occasional rest, what else could they accept but the system of adjusting the balance of power which has obtained in Europe, in which the few strong nations dictate the very terms on which all the others shall be content to live. When this hateful system should fail at last, foreign nations would intervene, now in favor of one, and then in aid of another; and thus our country, having expelled all European Powers from the continent, would relapse into an aggravated form of its colonial experience, and, like Italy, Turkey, India and China, become the theatre of transatlantic intervention and rapacity.

It, however, we grant to the new confederacies an exemption from complications among each other and with foreign States, still there is too much reason to believe that not one of them could long maintain a republican form of government. Universal suffrage and the absence of a standing army are essential to the republican system. The world has yet to see a single self-sustaining State of that kind, or even any confederation of such States, except our own. Canada leans on Great Britain not unwillingly, and Switzerland is guaranteed by interested monarchical States. Our own experiment has thus far been successful, because, by the continual addition of new States, the influence of each of the members of the Union is constantly restrained and reduced. No one, of course, can foretell the way and manner of travel; but history indicates with unerring certainty the end which the several confederacies would reach. Licentiousness would render life intolerable, and they would sooner or later purchase tranquility and domestic safety by the surrender of liberty, and yield themselves up to the protection of military despotism.

Indulge me, sir, in one or two details under this head.

First: It is only sixty days since this disunion movement began; already, those who are engaged in it have canvassed with portentous freedom the possible recombinations of the States when dissevered, and the feasible alliances of those recombinations with European nations—alliances as unnatural, and which would prove ultimately as pestilential to society here, as that of the Tlascalans with the Spaniard, who promised them revenge upon their ancient enemies, the Aztecs.

Secondly: The disunion movement arises partly out of a dispute over the common domain of the United States. Hitherto the Union has confined this controversy within the bounds of political debate by referring it, with all the other national ones, to the arbitrament of the ballot-box. Does any one suppose that disunion would transfer the whole domain to either party, or that any other umpire than war would, after dissolution, be invoked?

Thirdly: This movement arises, in another view, out of the relation of African slaves to the domestic population of the country. Freedom is to them, as to all mankind, the chief object of desire. Hitherto, under the operation of the Union, they have practically remained ignorant of the controversy, especially of its bearing on themselves. Can we hope that flagrant civil war shall rage among ourselves in their very presence, and yet that they will remain stupid and idle spectators? Does history furnish us any satisfactory instruction upon the horrors of civil war among a people so brave, so skilled in arms, so earnest in conviction, and so intent in purpose, as we are? Is it a mere chimera which suggests an aggravation of those horrors beyond endurance, when, on either side, there shall occur the intervention of an uprising ferocious African slave population of four, or six, or perhaps twenty millions?

The opinions of mankind change, and with them the policies of nations. One hundred years ago all the commercial European States were engaged in transferring negro slaves from Africa to this hemisphere. To-day, all those States are firmly set in hostility to the extension and even to the practice of slavery. Opposition to it takes two forms: one European, which is simple, direct abolition, effected, if need be, by compulsion; the other American, which seeks to arrest the African slave trade, and resist the entrance of domestic slavery into Territories where it is yet unknown, while it leaves the disposition of existing slavery to the considerate action of the States by which it is retained. It is the Union that restricts the opposition to slavery in this country within these limits. If dissolution prevail, what guaranty shall there be against the full development here of the fearful and uncompromising hostility to slavery which elsewhere pervades the world, and of which the recent invasion of Virginia was an illustration?

Mr. President, I have designedly dwelt so long on the probable effects of disunion upon the safety of the American people as to leave me little time to consider the other evils which must follow in its train. But, practically, the loss of safety involves every other form of public calamity. When once the guardian angel has taken flight, everything is lost.

Dissolution would not only arrest, but extinguish the greatness of our country. Even if separate confederacies could exist and endure, they could severally preserve no share of the common *prestige* of the Union. If the constellation is to be broken up, the stars, whether scattered widely apart or grouped in smaller clusters, will thenceforth shed forth feeble, glimmering and lurid lights. Nor will great achievements be possible for the new confederacies. Dissolution would signalize its triumph by acts of wantonness which would shock and astound the world. It would provincialize Mount Vernon and give this Capitol over to desolation at the very moment when the dome is rising over our heads that was to be crowned with the statue of liberty. After this there would remain for disunion no act of stupendous infamy to be committed. No petty confederacy that shall follow the United States can prolong, or even renew, the majestic drama of national progress. Perhaps it is to be arrested because its sublimity is incapable of continuance. Let it be so, if we have indeed become degenerate. After Washington, and the inflexible Adams, Henry, and the peerless Hamilton, Jefferson, and the majestic Clay, Webster, and the acute Calhoun, Jackson, the modest Taylor, and Scott, who rises in greatness under the burden of years, and Franklin, and Fulton, and Whitney, and Morse, have all performed their parts, let the curtain fall!

While listening to these debates, I have sometimes forgotten myself in marking their contrasted effects upon the page who customarily stands on the dais before me, and the venerable Senator who sits behind him. The youth exhibits intense but pleased emotion in the excitement, while at every irreverent word that is uttered against the Union the eyes of the good man are suffused with tears. Let him weep no more. Rather rejoice, for yours has been a lot of rare felicity. You have seen and been a part of all the greatness of your country, the towering national greatness of all the world. Weep only you, and weep with all the bitterness of anguish, who are just stepping on the threshold of life; for that greatness perishes prematurely and exists not for you, nor for me, nor for any that shall come after us.

The public prosperity! and how could it survive the storm? Its elements are industry in the culture of every fruit; mining of all the metals; commerce at home and on every sea; material improvement that knows no obstacle and has no end; invention that ranges throughout the domain of nature; increase of knowledge as broad as the human mind can explore; perfection of art as high as human genius can reach; and social refinement working for the renovation of the world. How could our successors prosecute these noble objects in the midst of brutalizing civil conflict? What guaranties will capital invested for such purposes have, that will outweigh the premium offered by political and military ambition? What leisure will the citizen find for study, or invention, or art, under the reign of conscription; nay, what interest in them will society feel when fear and hate shall have taken possession of the national mind? Let the miner in California take heed; for its golden wealth will become the prize of the nation that can command the most iron. Let the borderer take care; for the Indian will again lurk around his dwelling. Let the pioneer come back into our denser settlements; for the railroad, the post road, and the telegraph, advance not one furlong farther into the wilderness. With standing armies consuming the substance of our people on the land, and our navy and our postal steamers withdrawn from the ocean, who will protect or respect, or who will even know by name our petty confederacies? The American man-of-war is a noble spectacle. I have seen it enter an ancient port in the Mediterranean. All the world wondered at it, and talked of it. Salvos of artillery, from forts and shipping in the harbor, saluted its flag. Princes and princesses and merchants paid it homage, and all the people blessed it as a harbinger of hope for their own ultimate freedom. I imagine now the same noble vessel again entering the same haven. The flag of thirty-three stars and thirteen stripes has been hauled down, and in its place a signal is run up, which flaunts the device of a lone star or a palmetto tree. Men ask, "Who is the stranger that thus steals into our waters?" The answer contemptuously given is, "She comes from one of the obscure republics of North America. Let her pass on."

Lastly, public liberty, our own peculiar liberty, must languish for a time, and then cease to live. And, such a liberty! free movement everywhere through our own land and throughout the world; free speech, free press, free suffrage, the freedom of every subject to vote on every law, and for or against every agent who expounds, administers, or executes. Unstable and jealous confederacies, constantly apprehending assaults without and treason within, formidable only to each other, and contemptible to all besides; how long will it be before, on the plea of public safety, they will surrender all this inestimable and unequalled liberty, and accept the hateful and intolerable espionage of military despotism?

And now, Mr. President, what is the cause for this sudden and eternal sacrifice of so much safety, greatness, happiness, and freedom? Have foreign nations combined, and are they coming in rage upon us? No. So far from being enemies, there is not a nation on earth that is not an interested, admiring friend. Even The London *Times*, by no means partial to us, says:

"It is quite possible that the problem of a democratic republic may be solved by its overthrow in a few days in a spirit of folly, selfishness, and shortsightedness.

Has the Federal government become tyrannical or oppressive, or even rigorous or unsound? Has the Constitution lost its spirit, and all at once collapsed into a lifeless letter? No: the Federal government smiles more benignantly, and works to-day more beneficently than ever. The Constitution is even the chosen model for the organization of the newly-rising confederacies.

The occasion is the election of a President of the United States who is unacceptable to a portion of the people. I state the case accurately. There was no movement of disunion before the ballots which expressed that choice were cast. Disunion began as soon as the result was announced. The justification it assigned was that Abraham Lincoln had been elected, while the success of either one of three other candidates would have been acquiesced in. Was the election illegal? No; it is unimpeachable. Is the candidate personally offensive? No; he is a man of unblemished virtue and amiable manners. Is an election of President an unfrequent and extraordinary transaction? No; we never had a chief magistrate otherwise designated than by such election, and that form of choice is renewed every four years. Does any one even propose to change the mode of appointing the chief magistrate? No; election by universal suffrage, as modified by the Constitution, is the one crowning franchise of the American people. To save it, they would defy the world. Is it apprehended that the new President will usurp despotic powers? No; while he is of all men the most unambitious, he is, by the partial success of those who opposed his election, subjected to such restraints that he cannot, without their consent, appoint a minister or even a police agent, negotiate a treaty, or procure the passage of a law, and can hardly draw a musket from the public arsenals to defend his own person.

What, then, is the ground of discontent? It is that the disunionists did not accept as conclusive the arguments which were urged in behalf of the successful candidate in the canvass. This is all. Were their own arguments against him more satisfactory to his supporters? Of course they were not; they could not be. Does the Constitution, in letter or spirit, require or imply that the arguments of one party shall be satisfactory to the other? No; that is impossible. What is the constitutional remedy for this inevitable dissatisfaction? Renewed debate and ultimate rehearing in a subsequent election. Have the now successful majority perverted power to the purposes of oppression? No; they have never before held power. Alas! how prone we are to undervalue privileges and blessings. How gladly, how proudly, would the people of any nation in Europe accept, on such terms as we enjoy it, the boon of electing a chief magistrate every four years by free, equal, and universal suffrage? How thankfully would they cast aside all their own systems of government, and accept this republic of ours, with all its shortcomings and its disappointments, maintain it with their arms, and cherish it in their hearts. Is it not the very boon for which they supplicate God without ceasing, and even wage war, with intermissions only resulting from exhaustion? How strange are the times in which we live! The coming spring season, on one side of the Atlantic, will open on a general conflict, waged to obtain, through whatever indirection, just such a system as ours; and on this side of the Atlantic, within the same parallels of latitude, it will open on fraternal war, waged in a moment of frenzied discontent to overthrow and annihilate the same institutions. Do men, indeed, live only for themselves, to revenge their own wrongs, or to gratify their own ambition? Rather, do not men live least of all for themselves, and chiefly for posterity and for their fellow-men? Have the American people, then, become all of a sudden unnatural, as well as unpatriotic? and will they disinherit their children of the precious estate held only in trust for them, and deprive the world of the best hopes it has enjoyed since the human race began its slow and painful, yet needful and wisely-appointed progress?

Here I might close my plea for the American Union; but it is necessary, if not to exhaust the argument, at least to exhibit the whole case. The disunionists, consciously unable to stand on their mere disappointment in the recent election, have attempted to enlarge their ground. More than thirty years there has existed a considerable—though not heretofore a formidable—mass of citizens in certain States situated near or around the delta of the Mississippi who believe that the Union is less conducive to the welfare and greatness of those States than a smaller confederacy, embracing only slave States, would be. This class has availed itself of the discontents resulting from the election to put into operation the machinery of dissolution long ago prepared and waiting only for occasion. In other States there is a soreness because of the want of sympathy in the free States with the efforts of slaveholders for the recapture of fugitives from service. In all the slave States there is a restiveness resulting from the resistance which has been so determinedly made within the last few years, in the free States, to the extension of slavery in the common Territories of the United States. The Republican party which cast its votes for the successful Presidential candidate on the ground of that policy, has been allowed, practically, no representation, no utterance, by speech or through the press, in the slave States; while its policy, principles, and sentiments, and even its temper have been so misrepresented as to excite apprehensions that it denies important Constitutional obligations, and aims even at interference with slavery, and its overthrow by State authorities, or intervention by the Federal government. Considerable masses, even in the free States, interested in the success of these misrepresentations as a means of partisan strategy, have lent their sympathy to the party aggrieved. While the result of the election brings the Republican party necessarily into the foreground in resisting disunion, the prejudices against them which I have described have deprived them of the cooperation of many good and patriotic citizens. On a complex issue between the Republican party and the disunionists, although it involves the direst national calamities, the result might be doubtful; for the Republican party is weak in a large part of the Union. But on a direct issue, with all who cherish the Union on one side, and all who desire its dissolution by force on the other, the verdict would be prompt and almost unanimous. I desire thus to simplify the issue, and for that purpose to separate from it all collateral questions, and relieve it of all partisan passions and prejudices.

I consider the idea of the withdrawal of the Gulf States, and their permanent reorganization, with or without others, in a distinct Confederacy as a means of advantage to themselves, so certainly unwise and so obviously impossible of execution, when the purpose is understood that I dismiss it with the discussion I have already incidentally bestowed upon it.

The case is different, however, in regard to the other subjects which I have brought in this connection before the Senate.

Beyond a doubt Union is vitally important to the Republican citizens of the United States; but it is just as important to the whole people. Republicanism and Union are, therefore, not convertible terms. Republicanism is subordinate to Union, as everything else is and ought to be—Republicanism, democracy, every other political name and thing; all are subordinate, and they ought to disappear in the presence of the great question of Union. So far as I am concerned, it shall be so; it should be so if the question were sure to be tried as it ought only to be determined by the peaceful ordeal of the ballot. It should be so all the more since there is on one side preparedness to refer it to the arbitrament of civil war. I have such faith in this republican system of ours, that there is no political good which I desire that I am not content to seek through the peaceful forms of administration without involving revolutionary action. If others shall invoke that form of action to oppose and overthrow government, they shall not, so far as it depends on me, have the excuse that I obstructed it myself to be misunderstood. In such a case I can afford to meet prejudice with conciliation, exaction with concession which surrenders no principle, and violence with the right hand of peace. Therefore, sir, so far as the abstract question whether, by the Constitution of the United States, the bondsman, who is made such by the laws of a State, is still a man or only property, I answer that, within that State, its laws on that subject are supreme; that when he has escaped from that State into another, the Constitution regards him as a bondsman who may not, by any law or regulation of that State, be discharged from his service, but shall be delivered up, on claim, to the party to whom his service is due. While prudence and justice would combine in persuading you to modify the acts of Congress on that subject, so as not to oblige private persons to assist in their execution, and to protect freemen from being, by abuse of the laws, carried into slavery, I agree that all laws of the States, whether free States or slave States, which relate to this class of persons, or any others recently coming from or resident in other States, and which laws contravene the Constitution of the United States, or any law of Congress passed in conformity thereto, ought to be repealed.

Secondly. Experience in public affairs has confirmed my opinion that domestic slavery, existing in any State, is wisely left by the Constitution of the United States exclusively to the care, management and disposition of that State, and if it were in my power, I would not alter the Constitution in that respect. If misapprehension of my position needs so strong a remedy, I am willing to vote for an amendment of the Constitution, declaring that it shall not, by any future amendment, be so altered as to confer on Congress a power to abolish or interfere with slavery in any State.

Thirdly. While I think that Congress has exclusive and sovereign authority to legislate on all subjects whatever in the common Territories of the United States, and while I certainly shall never, directly or indirectly, give my vote to sanction or establish slavery in such Territories, or anywhere else in the world, yet the question what constitutional laws shall at any time be passed in regard to the Territories is, like every other question, to be determined on practical grounds. I voted for enabling acts in the cases of Oregon, Minnesota, and Kansas, without being able to secure in them such provisions as I would have preferred; and yet I voted wisely. So now I am well satisfied that, under existing circumstances, a happy and satisfactory solution of the difficulties in the remaining Territories would be obtained by similar laws, providing for their organization, if such organization were otherwise practicable. If, therefore, Kansas were admitted as a State under the Wyandot Constitution, as I think she ought to be, and if the organic laws of all the other Territories could be repealed, I could vote to authorize the organization and admission of two new States which should include them, reserving the right to effect subdivisions of them, whenever necessary, into several convenient States; but I do not find that such reservations could be constitutionally made. Without them, the ulterior embarrassments which would result from the hasty incorporation of States of such vast extent and various interests and character would outweigh all the immediate advantages of such a measure. But if the measure were practicable, I should prefer a different course, namely: when the eccentric movements of secession and disunion shall have ended, in whatever form that end may come, and the angry excitements of the hour shall have subsided, and calmness once more shall have resumed its accustomed sway over the public mind, then, and not until then—one, two, or three years hence—I should cheerfully advise a convention of the people, to be assembled in pursuance of the Constitution, to consider and decide whether any and what amendments of the organic national law ought to be made. A Republican now—as I have heretofore been a member of other parties existing in my day—I nevertheless hold and cherish, as I have always done, the principle that this government exists in its present form only by the consent of the governed, and that it is as necessary as it is wise to resort to the people for revisions of the organic law when the troubles and dangers of the State certainly transcend the powers delegated by it to the public authorities. Nor ought the suggestion to excite surprise. Government, in any form, is a machine; this is the most complex one that the mind of man has ever invented, or the hand of man has ever framed. Perfect as it is, it ought to be expected that it will, at least as often as once in a century, require some modification to adapt it to the changes of society and alterations of empire.

Fourthly. I hold myself ready now, as always heretofore, to vote for any properly guarded laws which shall be deemed necessary to prevent mutual invasions of States by citizens of other States, and punish those who shall aid and abet them.

Notwithstanding the arguments of the gallant Senator from Oregon (General Lane), I remain of the opinion that physical bonds, such as highways, railroads, rivers and canals are vastly more powerful for holding civil communities together than any mere covenants, though written on parchment or engraved upon iron. I remain, therefore, content to my purpose to secure, if possible, the construction of two Pacific railways, one of which shall connect the ports around the mouths of the Mississippi, and the other the towns on the Missouri and the Lakes, with the harbors on our western coast.

If, in the expression of these views, I have not proposed what is desired or expected by many others, they will do me the justice to believe that I am as far from having suggested what in many respects would have been in harmony with cherished convictions of my own. I learned early from Jefferson that in political affairs we cannot always do what seems to be absolutely best. Those with whom we must necessarily act, entertaining different views, have the power and the right of carrying them into practice. We must be content to lead when we can, and to follow when we cannot lead; and if we cannot at any time do for our country all the good that we would wish, we must be satisfied with doing for her all the good that we can.

Having submitted my own opinions on this great crisis, it remains only to say that I shall cheerfully lend to the government my best support in whatever prudent yet energetic efforts it shall make to preserve the public peace, and to maintain and preserve the Union, advising only that it practise as far as possible the utmost moderation, forbearance and conciliation.

And now, Mr. President, what are the auspices of the country? I know that we are in the midst of alarms, and somewhat exposed to accidents unavoidable in seasons of tempestuous passions. We already have disorder, and violence has begun. I know not to what extent it may go. Still my faith in the Constitution and in the Union abides, because my faith in the wisdom and virtue of the American people remains unshaken. Coolness, calmness and resolution are elements of their character. They have been temporarily displaced, but they are reappearing. Soon enough, I trust, for safety, it will be seen that sedition and violence are only local and temporary, and that loyalty and affection to the Union are the natural sentiments of the whole country. Whatever dangers there shall be, there will be the determination to meet them; whatever sacrifices, private or public, shall be needful for the Union, they will be made. I feel sure that the hour has not come for this great nation to fall. This people, which has been studying to become wiser and better as it has grown older, is not perverse or wicked enough to deserve so dreadful and severe a punishment as dissolution. This Union has not yet accomplished what good for mankind was manifestly designed by him who appoints the seasons and prescribes the duties of States and empires. No, sir; if it were cast down by faction today, it would rise again and reappear in all its majestic proportions to-morrow. It is the only government that can stand here. Woe! woe! to the man that madly lifts his hand against it. It shall continue and endure; and men, in after times, shall declare that this generation, which saved the Union from such sudden and unlooked for dangers, surpassed in magnanimity even that one which laid its foundations in the eternal principles of liberty, justice, and humanity.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 19, 1861.

Correspondents will greatly oblige us by a careful observance of the following directions, viz.:

Letters enclosing matter for publication, or relating in any way to the editorial conduct of the paper, should be addressed, "Editor of the Anti-Slavery Standard, No. 5 Beekman street, New York."

Letters enclosing subscriptions, or relating in any way to the business of the office, should be addressed, "Publisher of the Anti-Slavery Standard, No. 5 Beekman street, New York."

SENATOR SEWARD'S SURRENDER.

So the Republicans have surrendered at last at discretion! We can hardly say "at last," either, for Heaven knows, it is about as soon as they could, and make a decent show of self-defence. We have looked for nothing better, ever since Mr. Adams made his extraordinary overture for delivering New Mexico bound hand and foot to the pro-slavery Philistines. But we had thought they might have stood out a little longer, if it were only for the look of the thing. But the Commander-in-Chief of the Forces has drawn his sword preparatory to surrendering it, not to using it in the defence of his side, which he had pronounced in his Higher Law speech to be the side of God and

Our Washington Correspondence.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 14, 1861.

THE secession movement goes on at the South, without the slightest symptom of a reactionary feeling among those who have thus far guided the revolution. The wealthier class in the cotton States were really, from the start, opposed to secession, but fell into the current to save themselves. These men more bitterly than ever regret the condition of the South, but the masses, the rabble, are for disunion. It is easy to see that the majority of the Southern members of Congress deprecate the secession movement, yet they are too much afraid of their constituents not to bow to their will. In the Senate, such men as Jeff. Davis, Wigfall, Toombs and Iverson are sincerely in favor of demolishing the present Confederacy. I am not sure that Davis ought to be included in this category, for, running through his entire speech, there was a piteous plea for compromise, and, if that were impossible, *for peace*. "Give us our rights," he said to the Republicans; "give to us a compromise; but if you will not do that, don't make war upon the new slaveholding confederacy." Davis and Hunter suddenly turn up the apostles of peace! Representing the land of the pistol and the bowie knife, of street rows and private butcheries, these Senators plead for a higher civilization than obtains anywhere on the face of the globe. "Shall we make a contest of brute force, like dogs?" asks Mr. Hunter. Why this peaceful policy just now from the lips of violent men? Just because *they fear the aroused and indignant North!* Meantime these fellows go on, all over the South, stealing government property, actually appropriating gold and silver belonging to the United States! It is precisely the cry of the street thief, of peace, non-coercion, when the constable is after him.

I was saying that most of the Southern Congressmen regret this secession movement. I believe that nearly all the Alabama delegation desire to remain here. Some of them, I know, feel like death at the prospect before them. The same is true of the Georgia delegation in the House. Several of the members look for the ruin of Georgia before this revolution is ended. Governor Brown, of Mississippi, was packing up his things to go back to Mississippi on Saturday, and the most of the day his wife was in tears at the prospect before them. Those who are intimate with the Governor say that he goes back to his native State a good deal more in sorrow than in anger. He is not half so angry with the Abolitionists as he is sorry to leave the Senate, and witness the disruption of the Union.

The Northern Democracy can thank itself for the present state of things. Presidents Pierce and Buchanan have deliberately patronized and encouraged the Southern Disunionists. Pierce took Jeff. Davis fresh from a gubernatorial contest in Mississippi, in which he ran openly as the disunion candidate. That was the direct issue, and Davis was beaten. Yet, without a sentence of disavowal, Pierce made the traitor his Secretary of War! The same policy was pursued in other portions of the South. The Disunionists were given the pick of the offices, and in this way the Disunion party was fostered by Pierce and Buchanan, until it now masters the entire people of the South.

The Secessionists have received something of a check in the Virginia Legislature, which refers the question of secession to the people, if the State Convention should pass such an act. In Tennessee the same provision has been made by the Legislature. This embarrasses the Secessionists, for it delays action, which is what they fear most. Not that there is any hope of preventing Virginia from seceding eventually, but it postpones the act till after Lincoln's inauguration. The Virginia Convention meets on the 13th of February, and it cannot get a vote upon the secession question within a week or two, for the delegates from Western Virginia will bitterly oppose disunion, and will discuss the question before a vote. Then the reference of the question to the people for final ratification postpones the decision too late to suit the fiery spirits of the Old Dominion. The grand object of the Secessionists is to get Virginia out of the Union before the 4th of March. This will be a difficult matter, but it may be attained. If Maryland secedes at all, it is now evident that it will not be before the middle or end of March. The same is true of Kentucky and Tennessee. This will give Mr. Lincoln a chance to develope his policy before the border slave States are all out of the Union, and also allow an opportunity for a reaction at the South. This is really all the hope there is of the present Union. The policy of the Republicans seems to be to keep the seat of government at Washington at all hazards, no matter if Maryland secedes, and to collect the revenues at Southern ports upon the decks of our men-of-war. But there are almost insuperable obstacles in the way of this. In the first place, if Maryland leaves the Union, the Capital will be one hundred miles in an enemy's country. How is the line of communication between the Capital and the loyal States to be kept open? It would take 50,000 soldiers to protect the railway from this city through Baltimore to the Pennsylvania line. Civil war would break forth here in all its horrors. Maryland and Virginia would doubtless be devastated, and slavery driven out from both those States. But in the event of a complete separation of the slave from the free States, treachery would undoubtedly show itself in the army and the navy. Under such circumstances as these, would it not be best for the free States to recognize the successful revolution and withdraw to a Northern city, to prepare the Northern Confederacy for a tremendous struggle with the hosts of darkness? This course, very likely, would avert the war. The South, seeing that we were fully prepared to meet them upon the battle-field, would be pretty sure to offer very fair treaties. The North would not return runaway slaves any more; and if the South saw fit to demand it, as the price of a commercial treaty, then she might take the alternative of a war which would not end till slavery was abolished with the sword. I know that a good many Republican members of Congress begin to look more favorably upon a peaceable separation. The worst danger to be apprehended from this policy is, that Douglas and his crew might seduce a majority of the States into a reconstruction of the Union upon the basis of the Crittenden proposition. That is what Douglas is now after—peaceable separation, and then reconstruction. He says, very truly, that after a war between the sections, a reunion will be impossible. He very well knows that if the government remains here, and enforces the laws at the hazard of a war with the slave States, it will result either in the return of those States to live under the present Constitution, unamended, or a final separation. I do not believe, however, that the North will make concessions to a set of rebels. If the slave States all secede, it will be too late for such degradation on the part of the North. Even the doughfaces will ask, What good will it do?

The probability of the secession of Maryland from the Union is very strong, since the somerset performed by Senator Pearce of that State. He has all along stood by Governor Hicks, who refuses to call the Legislature together. The Secessionists have been at work upon Pearce, until he has written a letter, from which I make a brief extract:

"There was no authority for the public report which you refer to, that I had fully indorsed Gov. Hicks's course, inasmuch as I had not proclaimed my opinion on the subject. But I do not hesitate to say to you, that when the demand was made upon him for a call of the Legislature, I was not satisfied of its necessity. I preferred that time should be given to Congress to accomplish an adjustment, which I hoped the patriotic and conservative feeling of the country would sanction, and indeed require. In this hope I have been disappointed, and the prospect of such an adjustment becomes more faint, while the progress of events is so rapid and threatening that I now think that the Legislature ought to be soon called. We cannot, by remaining quiet, escape the storm which now seems likely to burst upon us. Anxious as I am for the preservation of the Union, the value of which to all the States has been immense and most precious, I think that the dangers which threaten us may be best averted, if at all, by the action of the people through their representatives. I hope, therefore, that the Legislature will be called together by the Governor, whose sincerity I do not in the least question. If Congress cannot recommend some adjustment to the conventions of the States, I shall fear the disruption of the Union, unless the people of the States, in their conventions, can find that remedy for which Congress is at a loss.

"I believe that the South would accept the propositions submitted by the eloquent and eminent Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Crittenden), whose noble character is a guaranty of his honest and patriotic purposes. If the representatives here of the non-slaveholding States will do nothing to allay the agitation which distracts the country, our only hope is in the people of their States acting through other representatives."

This letter will show you that one of the most ardent and anxious of the Compromisers in Congress has given up his hopes of any important concessions from the North. This is the general opinion here. I do not doubt that there are members of Congress enough who personally desire a compromise, and who would vote for one if the act concerned only themselves, but they fear their constituents.

I know scarcely what to say of Mr. Seward's speech. You will make your own comments upon it. Here the criticisms upon it are conflicting. Some Republicans assert that, in reality, there is no compromise in it. Most of the Southerners here say the same. But there *are* Southern politicians who like the speech, and claim that Mr. Seward is, at heart, in favor of compromise. You can judge best of the speech, removed as you are from the excitement and enthusiasm raised here by its delivery. For no other man and no other speech has created such a wonderful enthusiasm in Washington. Thousands of people were unable to gain admittance to the Senate galleries, and yet remained outside to learn, as quickly as possible, the character of the speech. The Southern Senators and Representatives listened to every word of it in breathless silence, and some of them were deeply impressed by it. The picture of the war between the sections, to result from disunion, seemed to appal the more thoughtful of the Southern Congressmen, and their faces were solemn as the grave. It was somewhat singular to see Senator Crittenden, for he was entirely overcome by the speech, and cried over portions of it like a child. That such men as he perceive in disunion the utter destruction of the South, and especially of slavery, is certain. A few hotheads in the cotton States imagine that they can meet the world in arms, but the intelligent people of the South do not think so. When the secession epidemic shall have abated in its violence, the South will find, *too late*, that she has consummated her own ruin, and, to spite the anti-slavery conscience of the North, *has herself abolished slavery!*

AVON.

DR. CHEEVER AND THE AMERICAN ABOLITIONISTS.

On the 16th of November last, Dr. Cheever met the members of the Edinburgh Ladies' Emancipation Society, the room being crowded to excess by a deeply interested audience. After receiving an address of sympathy and welcome, Dr. Cheever made some remarks, a report of which we find in *The Caledonian Mercury*, and copy below. We are glad to put on record this hearty and unqualified testimony to our cause, to the character of its supporters as men of integrity and Christian spirit, to the corruption of the American Churches, and to the *slanderous* character of the charges and imputations against Abolitionists:—

"Dr. Cheever, in returning thanks, spoke of the grounds of effort which had been alluded to—namely, those springing from love to God and obedience to his Word and Spirit in the heart. The warfare in this cause must be moral and religious, for no political movement could reach the great evil of American slavery. The great Republican party merely aimed to prevent the extension of slavery into fresh Territories, and, as a party, would not object to the Fugitive Slave law; but the Church of God sought to abolish slavery at once, and from the place where it is at present. Dr. Cheever then commended to the sympathy of his hearers the Church Anti-Slavery Society, which has recently been formed in America to prosecute by a fresh agency the great anti-slavery movement. Organized as it had been on such a basis as to afford no ground of exception to any, it had yet met with so little sympathy from the Churches of America that it was unable to sustain even one agent in the field, the point of stumbling among the professing Christians of America being the declaration in the Constitution of the Society that slavery was a crime, and slaveholding, in itself, a sin against God. This was a striking illustration that it was not because of any error of Abolitionists that sympathy was withheld from anti-slavery effort, but because of the "cross" involved in adopting anti-slavery principles in America—because of the sacrifices, commercially and otherwise, which those must make who freely espouse the slave's cause. He had expected that there would be full sympathy ready for him in this country, but he found these influences had extended even here. He attributed them to the commercial and social relations that exist with America. He had found calumnies and slanders of the grossest description prevailing—more, in fact, than he could have supposed possible. He would say, as a general rule, that it was safe to consider all slanders against Abolitionists as perfectly untrue. It was certainly the case, as those present were aware, that mixtures like those with David at Adullam had been in the anti-slavery ranks, where persons had sometimes uttered sentiments offensive to Christian sense and feeling; but for such sentiments as these the Church, so called, was to blame, and the wonder was it had not made more infidels than were to be found in America from its unfaithfulness to its own mission. Dr. Cheever paid a very noble tribute to Mr. Garrison, with whom he had held many long and earnest conversations. He could testify to his being anything but an infidel; on the contrary, to his being a man who lived in the fear of God, and the love of Christ as his Savior—who led a pure and blameless life, and was an earnest and fearless friend of the slave. Dr. Cheever mentioned his having attended the last anniversary meeting of the New England Abolitionists, where he had heard no sentiments but such as any Christian could have listened to with interest; and he had felt that his doing so, and the sympathy it evinced, had been of great value, and would tend to cement the union of all who were earnest for the abolition of slavery. He then gave a lucid sketch of the difficulties in the Church of the Puritans, and sought the sympathy of friends in this country. His address throughout was deeply interesting and impressive; and a hope was expressed that, as numbers could not gain admittance to the meeting, an early opportunity would be afforded of hearing him."

MOBOCRACY AT ROCHESTER.

THE faithful friends of freedom now engaged in holding a series of Anti-Slavery Conventions in the interior of the Empire State, are beset, it seems, by a mobocratic spirit, which has broken out just now as a weak echo of the revolutionary disturbances at the South. The following letter to *The Tribune* was written, we presume, by Aaron M. Powell:

ROCHESTER, Monday, Jan. 14, 1861.

The Anti-Slavery Convention has been in session in this city for three days past. It adjourned *sine die* last evening. For several days previous, and during its sessions, this Convention has been the occasion of much excitement throughout the city. On Friday morning, a flag suspended across Buffalo street, announcing the meeting, and bearing the motto, "*No compromise with slaveholders*," was ordered down by the Common Council, on account of the excited feeling it occasioned among the citizens. The Convention assembled in Corinthian Hall, in the afternoon, without disturbance. An audience of several hundred persons was in attendance, and addresses were delivered by Susan B. Anthony, who presided, by the Rev. Samuel J. May, and A. M. Powell. Resolutions of an ultra tone were introduced. Meanwhile a meeting of the Common Council was in session, with a protracted discussion upon the question as to what should be done in the evening, as rumors of mob violence were rife. It was finally decided that the Convention should be protected, and free speech maintained. A large audience assembled in the evening, made up of several hundred intelligent people, friendly to the objects of the meeting, and several hundred more of mobocrats, similar in character to those of the recent mob in Boston—with "intensely respectable" broadcloth leaders and ugly "roughs," hand in hand, shoulder to shoulder.

Attempts were made in vain for a hearing by Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Miss Anthony, and Messrs. May and Powell. The Sheriff, Mayor, several Aldermen, and Chief of Police, with a strong force were in attendance, but seemed powerless to control the unruly "gentlemen of property and standing." After a period of wild and boisterous excitement and confusion, the Chief of Police declared the meeting adjourned till Friday afternoon, at which announcement the mob sent up a torrent of triumphant yells.

On Friday afternoon a large and orderly meeting was held, and the efforts of the city authorities proved more effectual than the evening previous. There was a large delegation of turbulent spirits present at that session, but in the evening they rallied again in full force by many hundreds. They were mostly, however, outside of the hall, the price of admission for men having been raised to fifty cents. Desperate efforts were made to force an entrance to the hall, but they were effectually resisted by the police. The discussions within were uninterrupted and listened to by a good-sized audience.

The proprietor of the hall, under very threatening pressure from the mobocrats, was constrained to cancel his contract for the hall yesterday, so the Convention adjourned to meet in Zion's Church (colored), where two sessions were held. Large audiences were in attendance, with the Mayor, several of the Aldermen, Chief of Police, with an efficient force. Many threats were abroad that the building would be demolished, etc., but the inalienable right of free speech was triumphantly vindicated, and the Convention adjourned *sine die* at a late hour last night.

P.

THE SPIRIT OF PENNSYLVANIA.—In the House of Representatives of Pennsylvania, on Monday last, Mr. Williams, of Allegheny, made a powerful speech, averring the right of coercion, opposing compromise, advocating a vigorous exercise of the powers of the government to suppress secession by force; assailing severely the petitions for the repeal of the 95th section of the Penal Code; holding all attempts at compromise futile, past compromises having been failures; saying that the Union must be reconstructed ultimately by the readmission of the conquered provinces; and that the shedding of a small amount of blood now would save oceans hereafter. There were vast numbers present, and applause from the galleries was frequent.

THE TWENTY-SEVENTH NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY SUBSCRIPTION-ANNIVERSARY.

THE claims of this anniversary can hardly fail, at the present hour, to be recognized. Its funds are devoted, *not* to African colonization; *not* to political partisanship; *not* to theological and metaphysical polemics; *not* to the separate education or religious instruction of persons of color; *not* to the fomenting of sectional prejudice, civil war, or bloody insurrection; *not* to the relief or redemption of individuals.

These subscriptions have always been appropriated to the work of awakening the public conscience, enlarging the popular heart, and enlightening the national mind, that, by the practical application, through legitimate channels, of the acknowledged religious and political principles of this country, slavery might be abolished and the whole land made happy and united: *not* through enforced emancipation, but by voluntary enfranchisement.

There is no longer any need of defining or describing the brutal system of slavery that, since 1789, has been demoralizing the country. A lifetime—under violence, loss, and continual annoyance—has been spent in doing *that*. The people know, *now*, that it is no distant, imaginary evil, but one that overshadows every life with danger and dishonor. While fulfilling even the simplest duty of humanity to any perishing fellow-creature who has taken refuge in the sanctuary of their own homes, their whole nature is outraged by the thought that he may be mercilessly seized as a slave, from the very hearth. They cannot protect a hunted child from a fate worse than death, without the risk of being themselves broken down for life by fine and imprisonment.

Of course, the pious refusal of free Northern populations to obey such diabolical mockeries of Constitutions and laws, with the simultaneous determination of slaveholding ones at the South never to permit their amendment, necessitates revolution. And now, no qualified observer, surveying the country, can hesitate to acknowledge the great work already done by the American Anti-Slavery Society. It has enabled the Northern populations to meet the present crisis with calm and intelligent resolution; and if the American Anti-Slavery Society had been earlier sustained, to diffuse its deep human feelings, its true counsels and accurate knowledge, more extensively, the masses of the people would betimes have been so warmly and wisely devoted to this magnificent cause, that revolution would have been purely moral, and no disturbing crisis like the present could have occurred.

But the wrong a few just and generous persons have been unable to prevent, may still, by timely coöperation with them, be retrieved.

In the very nature of things as they here exist, it will always rest with disinterested persons in private life to initiate every change for the better. Under its present cherished institutions, the country must always look beyond its Church and State dignitaries, its political and ecclesiastical servants, for the previous preparation indispensable to national progress; for how can a Governor, a Senator, a Judge, a minister of any denomination or religious society, take the lead? Every such public functionary is engaged by the people not to lead, but to serve; not to make creeds and constitutions, but to administer under them; not to make things what they should be, but to take them exactly as they are.

Hence the need of an auxiliary private, voluntary service, like that which for the last seven and twenty years the American Anti-Slavery Society has by this anniversary helped to fulfil. Its claims to popular support begin to be felt. The moral vanguard of the people, whether in a sovereign or a functionary capacity, begins to see the mistake of sending a noble official servant to reap where no generous voluntary service of good and thoughtful men has previously sowed. Let all now unite to sustain such a service—the only possible means of peaceful national progress—the only possible condition of national growth or guaranty for continued national existence.

After having for a life-time done what we could in this behalf, have we not established its claim upon every thoughtful, just and noble soul? On all such we cordially and confidently rely for both moral support and pecuniary aid. *Both* will be afforded by the act of subscription to which we now invite.

We entreat our friends to remember that, however advantageous and indispensable the largest sums subscribed, none confer on us a higher obligation than the smaller one which the guest offers, regretting that it is the largest in his power.

Guests will find their invitations at the Anti-Slavery Standard Office, New York, and at the Anti-Slavery Office in Philadelphia.

In behalf of the Twenty-seventh National Anti-Slavery Subscription-Anniversary,

MARIA WESTON CHAPMAN.

COVENANTERS' TESTIMONY VS. PRESIDENT BUCHANAN AND GOV. FAIRBANKS'S FAST.

TOPSHAM, Vermont, Jan. 8th, 1861.

To the Editor of The National Anti Slavery Standard.

HEREWITH I send you the testimony of an anti-slavery meeting, composed mostly of Covenanters, held in this place on Friday the 4th inst., afternoon and evening. The resolutions, which were discussed spiritedly during both sessions and until a late hour in the evening, were passed as reported by the Committee, except the clause in parenthesis in the 5th resolution, which, by a small majority, was stricken out in accordance with the views of some who thought the language stronger than is justified by the language of the Constitution.

I should add that three of the series of resolutions were not voted upon, but were laid on the table to be discussed at a subsequent meeting to be held on the 18th inst. These resolutions bear principally on the pro-slavery character of the Churches, and they are expected to call out the opposition of members of pro-slavery Churches, especially the Methodists, and a hot time is expected. Let it come. Our hope, under God, is in that truth whose faithful utterance agitates "workers of iniquity" and their allies.

1. Resolved, That though we believe nations and civil rulers, under extraordinary circumstances, may authoritatively proclaim a fast, yet we do not and cannot regard the official call of the President of the United States to observe this as a day of fasting as at all binding upon us: *first*, because the United States Government, of which he is the chief executive, is not the moral ordinance of God, and hence may not be voluntarily supported by the Christian. *Second*, because James Buchanan is not *our* President. We do not acknowledge him as *our* agent to execute law, or *our* ruler to whom we owe any conscientious obedience. *Third*, Because he does not call the nation to fasting on account of the real causes of God's displeasure, viz., national sins, such as Atheism, Infidelity, rejection of the Mediator as King of nations, and most cruel oppression. *Fourth*, because those very things which the President deprecates as evils we rather rejoice in; and those very things for whose preservation he asks us to pray, we would rather see destroyed.

2. Whereas, President Buchanan, in his recent message, advises to amend the Constitution so that it may recognize the right of property in slaves in those States where it now exists or may hereafter exist, and so as to more effectually pledge and secure the surrender of fugitive slaves, as well as to make all Personal Liberty laws of the Northern States null and void:

Whereas, he believes that these proposed amendments are necessary to the preservation of the Union, and in his proclamation asks the people to pray for the preservation of the Constitution and the Union, thereby asking prayer that such infamous amendments may be made so as to save the Union:

Whereas, the President, having laid the blame of the present troubles in the country to "the violent agitation of the slavery question at the North," now proclaims a fast that we, Abolitionists, may confess our faults to God:

And, whereas, the Governor of Vermont unites with the President in proclaiming a fast:

Therefore, Resolved, that we cannot comply with the call of Gov. Fairbanks, but hereby testify against his conduct in the premises as unworthy of the chief executive of a State that has declared that "every person that has been held as a slave, who shall come into this State, *shall be free*."

3. Resolved, That the Constitution and the Union are at war with God and his law, and are hostile to human freedom, being among the strongest fortifications of the slave system; and hence we reject the Constitution as it is, and seek the destruction of the Union as it is, and, therefore, we cannot obey the call of either the President or the Governor, who ask us to fast and pray for the preservation of the Union as it is.

4. Resolved, That national sins—the causes of national judgments—are the proper causes of fasting; and all hope that this nation can escape the judgments of God is vain so long as it does not repent of national sins.

5. Resolved, That the great sins for which God has a controversy with the nation are, disregard of his divine authority—disregard of his Son and of his law—the organization of a Union and Federal Government into which slaveholding States were admitted and in which slaveholders are eligible to office—the adoption of a Federal Constitution which gives property representation in Congress, (compels the shooting down of slaves rising for liberty,) and requires the delivering up of slaves escaping from their merciless oppressors—the increase of slave territory—the waging of wars to recover lost slave property or to obtain more slave territory—the most wicked and cruel legislation in support of slavery and against freedom, especially the enactment of Fugitive Slave codes—the violation of plighted faith in the surrender of territory sacredly pledged to freedom, as in the Kansas-Nebraska act—the permission of all manner of wrongs and cruelties, imprisonments, exile, or death of Northerners condemned of no crime—the election of slaveholders, infidels and ungodly men to office—the profanation of the Lord's day by the Post Office department—the hatred of and injustice done to the African race, as if possessed of no rights which white men are bound to respect—the continuation of the foreign and inter-State slave trade—and the inhuman chattelization and most cruel oppression of four millions of God's unoffending children.

6. Resolved, That these sins are chargeable upon all citizens of the government, and indirectly upon all members of those Churches or denominations that fellowship slaveholders or allow their members to vote for them or to sustain this anti-Christian and slaveholding confederacy.

7. Resolved, That they are the true and most consistent friends of the country who refuse to sustain this guilty government, and who testify against its atheism and oppression; and we do most earnestly beseech our fellow-countrymen, and especially all fearers of God and haters of despotism, to come out from this blood-stained Union and help us to reform the people and the government, and thus save their own souls from guilt and the nation from the desolating judgments of God.

8. Resolved, That the Fast which God has chosen is "to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and to break every yoke"; therefore, for such a Fast we will labor and pray.

THE TWENTY-SEVENTH
National Anti-Slavery Subscription-Anniversary.

THE Ladies who have for so many years received the Subscriptions of their friends to the Cause, ask the favor of their company, as usual, at this time of the year, on

Wednesday, the 23d of January, Day and Evening,

IN THE MUSIC HALL, BOSTON.

As accidental omissions are almost unavoidable, even of those whose company is most desired, the Ladies hasten to say, that all who hate slavery, and wish to become subscribers to the funds for its peaceful, immediate abolition, without expatriation, may obtain special invitations (without which no one is ever admitted) at the Anti-Slavery Office, 221 Washington street, and of the Ladies at their respective homes.

MARIA WESTON CHAPMAN,	LYDIA D. PARKER,
MARY MAY,	ELIZA F. EDDY,
LOUISA LORING,	SARAH P. REMOND,
L. MARIA CHILD,	SARAH RUSSELL MAY,
HENRIETTA SARGENT,	ABBY KELLEY FOSTER,
ANNE WARREN WESTON,	SARAH H. SOUTHWICK,
MARY GRAY CHAPMAN,	EVELINA A. S. SMITH,
HELEN ELIZA GARRISON,	ANN REBECCA BRAMHALL,
SARAH SHAW RUSSELL,	AUGUSTA G. KING,
FRANCES MARY ROBBINS,	ELIZABETH VON ARNIM,
CAROLINE WESTON,	ANNA SHAW GREENE,
MARY WILLEY,	ELIZA APTHORP,
SARAH BLAKE SHAW,	MARY ELIZABETH SARGENT,
SUSAN C. CABOT,	MATTIE GRIFFITH,
SARAH P. ATKINSON,	ANNE LANGDON ALGER,
ELIZA ANDREW,	MARY E. STEARNS.

The friends of the Cause in distant cities, or in country towns, with whom we have been so long in correspondence, are earnestly entreated, for the sake of the Cause, at this moment of hope and cheer, when the very evidences of progress make it difficult to raise money in large sums—*to take up collections* in their respective neighborhoods; using all diligence to make the amount of smaller subscriptions supply any deficiency the hard times may possibly occasion in the larger ones. *Now*, as the very time for the most efficient expenditure, should be the time of most devoted effort. It is to be hoped that not a town in any State where we have ever had correspondence, nor an individual whose heart is in unison with ours on this subject, will be found wanting to our list. We have ample opportunity to know that there are many such at the South as well as at the North, for we are not exclusively of Northern birth, nor all free from the painful remembrance of having once been slaveholders. We hope to welcome as many as possible at the evening reception; at all events, to receive their subscriptions by letter. Some of the ladies will be ready, while directing the arrangements for the evening reception, to welcome and receive the subscriptions of all their friends who prefer to make their calls during the day.

The Germania Band will fill the pauses of conversation in the evening. The guests may leave cloaks and shawls in the care of the attendants at the entrance and in the anterooms.

Each invitation must be countersigned by the guest, as last year, before presenting it at the door.

Boston, December 25, 1860.

PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR AND NATIONAL BAZAAR.

THE Twenty-fifth Annual Fair was held in two spacious saloons of the Assembly Building, on the 11th, 12th, 13th, and 14th of December.

The receipts, $1,721 55, though not so great as in some former years, are considered large in view of the pressure in the money market, and the alarmed state of the community.

Beside the tables furnished by friends in the city, there were others supplied by Newtown and Makefield, Chester County, Abington, Byberry, Bristol, Mullica Hill, and Upper Dublin.

Contributions were received from Milton, Williamsport, Christiana, Downingtown, Darby, Newtown Square, Warwick Furnace, Norristown, Chelton Hills, and Ann Arbor, Michigan; also a very acceptable donation of £10 from a friend in London.

A box of goods, which we were advised by our earnest and faithful colaborers abroad would be shipped from Galway in ample time to reach us before the Bazaar, has not yet arrived.

This, our *Twenty-fifth Annual Fair*, has been held at a period of intense excitement in the community, on the question which Abolitionists, for more than a quarter of a century, have been laboring to bring before the public mind, so long cold and indifferent to the wrongs of the slave.

The first manifestation of this excitement threatened to be disastrous to his rights, and in opposition to our continued demands for their recognition.

In obedience to the call of Southern trading merchants and time-serving politicians, organized bands of ruffians menaced disturbance. Advice was received from official quarters to discontinue our Fair, and timid friends urged us to "Wait for a more convenient season." Your Committee the more deeply felt that, while so many voices were raised on behalf of the master, it was all important that those who had so long claimed to speak for the slave should not now be silent; that all the more should they plead his cause before an awakened people. We persevered in our plans, and carried them successfully through, raising our voice for "the suffering and the dumb" in the midst of pro-slavery clamor. The result has proved, as it did last year under somewhat similar circumstances, that our duty demands a firm and unyielding support of our position, doubting not that our principles will finally triumph.

One very noticeable feature of the time was the quiet, earnest devotion of the many young persons who had come to labor with us. When the expectation prevailed that a mob would attempt to break into our rooms, they calmly and firmly awaited the event; showing their appreciation of the momentous struggle now going on in this nation, and their resolution to abide by the right, "come weal, come woe." They could, with us, adopt the language of our noble pioneer, whose words spoke fittingly from the first banner that met the sight on entering the large saloon:

"I am an Abolitionist!
I glory in the name;
Though now by slavery's minions hissed,
And covered o'er with shame,
It is a spell of light and power,
The watchword of the free;
Who spurns it in the trial hour
A craven soul is he."

With full reliance on the principles and measures which we have hitherto advocated, we address ourselves to the work of the future.

SARAH PUGH, MARGARET J. BURLEIGH,
HARRIET D. PURVIS, SARAH A. MCKIM.

Philadelphia, Dec. 1860.

Note.—The box of goods from Galway has arrived in New York.

MASSACHUSETTS.—The portion of Governor Andrew's message referring to the Personal Liberty law has been referred in the Legislature to a Committee of Ten. The Chairman of this Committee is Mr. E. F. Stone, of Newburyport, who is believed to be opposed to repeal. Messrs. Albee of Marlboro', Pierce of Dorchester, Slack of Boston, and perhaps one or two others, are firm friends of the bill.

OBITUARY.

DIED, in the city of Philadelphia, at her residence, on the 3d inst., of consumption, after a lingering and painful illness, MARTHA H. BOND, wife of Josiah Bond, in the 54th year of her age. The remains were taken on the 5th inst. to Longwood Cemetery, in Chester County, where the company were met by a number of friends and a religious meeting held in the Longwood meeting-house.

"Spirit, thy labor is o'er,
Thy work of probation is done,
Thy steps are now bound for the untrodden shore,
And the life of immortals begun."

Peace to the memory of this humble, Christian woman.

J. A. D.

NO SLAVE-HUNTING IN THE EMPIRE STATE.

THE time has arrived when the friends of freedom in the Empire State are called upon to make a new and vigorous effort to procure the enactment of a statute that shall interpose an effectual barrier to the incursions of the Southern slave-hunter upon their soil. It is the more important that this effort should be made now, in view of the insolent demands of the Slave Oligarchy for the repeal of the Personal Liberty laws of other States, and of the disposition evinced by weak-kneed and weak-backed Republicans to offer the required sacrifice, in the hope of thereby smoothing their way to offices long coveted and now almost within reach. These Republican doughfaces must be made to understand that they cannot, with safety even to their own interest, trifle with the earnest, heartfelt anti-slavery sentiment of the North; and there is no better way of enforcing this lesson than by a general uprising of the people to demand the enactment of new safeguards against slave-hunting.

We subjoin a form of petition which we wish might, within the next six weeks, be presented to the members of every household in the Empire State. We are confident that, if proper efforts are made, ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND signatures may be very easily obtained.

PETITION.

To the Honorable Senate and Assembly of the State of New York:

The undersigned, citizens of —— State of New York, respectfully ask you to put an end to SLAVE-HUNTING, in New York, by enacting that no person, who has been held as a slave, shall be delivered up, by any officer or court, State or Federal, within this State, to any one claiming him on the ground that he owes "service or labor" to such claimant, by the laws of one of the slave States of this Union.

SEWARD'S SPEECH.—We have spoken our mind in regard to this speech in another column, but we cannot refrain from calling attention to a single passage, in which Mr. Seward exalts the Union above Liberty—the Means above the End. In the paragraph immediately preceding his enumeration of the concessions he is willing to make, he says:

"Beyond a doubt Union is vitally important to the Republican citizens of the United States; but it is just as important to the whole people. Republicanism and Union are, therefore, not convertible terms. Republicanism is subordinate to Union, as everything else is and ought to be—Republicanism, Democracy, every other political name and thing; all are subordinate—and they ought to disappear in the presence of the great question of Union. So far as I am concerned, it shall be so."

By Republicanism Mr. Seward must here mean the anti-slavery principles professed by that party. His declaration, therefore, that "Republicanism is subordinate to Union, as everything else is and ought to be," and that, "so far as he is concerned, IT SHALL BE SO," is an open betrayal of liberty to save the thing which was ordained only as a *means* of preserving it! And this is what is called statesmanship!

That Mr. Seward's speech is unworthy of a statesman representing the free North in such a crisis as the present, is sufficiently apparent in the fact, that even his friends find it impossible to say with certainty what he means. It is the speech of a man willing, if not anxious, to serve God, but more afraid of offending the Devil; anxious to please the friends of liberty, but wishing to conciliate the slaveholders and their tools. An apostle has said with truth, "A double-minded man is unstable in all his ways."

FREE SPEECH IN NEW YORK.—One day last week, Mr. Hinton Rowan Helper, formerly of North Carolina, but for some time a resident of this city, was announced to deliver a lecture on slavery in Clinton Hall. In consequence of a violent storm, few persons came to hear him, and the lecture was postponed. There were, however, some indications of a purpose to disturb the lecturer, and the rioters, after the audience had voted to adjourn, assembled in a corner and passed a series of Union-saving resolves. Last Monday evening was fixed as the time for the delivery of Mr. Helper's lecture, and the police, we understand, made ample provision to defend his right of speech; but the managers of the Hall, fearing a riot, shut their doors, thus violating their engagement and compelling Mr. Helper to forego his purpose of speaking. The rioters assembled in front of the building in great force, and it is said that many of them were armed as if for a desperate encounter. One of the ringleaders was taken to a station-house, where, to his great mortification, he was compelled to pass the night. This effort to put down the freedom of speech in this city, however annoying it may be for a time, must fail in the end.

MR. ADAMS AND HIS CONSTITUENTS.—An excellent article, well thought, well studied and well felt, in the Boston *Atlas and Bee* of the 9th inst, assures us that the constituents of Hon. Charles Francis Adams are astonished and mortified at his proposed compromises. The people of Massachusetts, it seems, will not consent to have their own homes, or any other men's homes, violated by slave-hunting and slave-breeding, for just as long a time as the slaveholder thinks fit.

Speaking of Mr. Adams reminds us that we inadvertently omitted to correct the error of our Washington correspondent in saying that Mr. Adams had not "the taint of Old Whiggery in his blood," but was once a "Liberty party man." Mr. Adams was a Whig till the nomination of Gen. Taylor in 1848—a "*Conscience* Whig," to be sure, but never a Liberty party man.

NO NEED OF STRIFE.—Not long ago, Senator Seward declared that there was, in the nature of things, an "irrepressible conflict" between slavery and freedom. In contrast with this self-evident truth, how absurd, cowardly and false is the following remark in his recent speech: "The different forms of labor" [i. e., the "form" (!) of working men under the lash, without compensation, and the "form" which recognizes the humanity of the laborer in the payment of wages], "if slavery were not perverted to purposes of political ambition, *need not constitute an element of strife* in the Confederacy"!!! In other words, there is no *necessary* conflict between slavery and freedom! What has changed the great leader of the Republican party from a lion to a mouse?

LIBERTY AND THE UNION.—Mr. Seward tells us that "public liberty, our own peculiar liberty, must languish for a time, and then cease to live," if the Union of the North with Southern men-stealers is dissolved. He goes on: "And such a liberty! *free movement everywhere through our own land* and throughout the world; *free speech, free press, the freedom of every subject to vote on every law, and for or against every agent who expounds, administers, or executes.*" That is to say, our rights in these various particulars depend on our being confederated with men and communities that systematically deny and trample upon them, and who hang or tar and feather us on the bare suspicion that we intend to exercise them! Is this statesmanship?

THE MEN FOR THE CRISIS.—The Washington correspondent of *The Times*, having alluded to the fact that the Hon. Owen Lovejoy of Illinois is expected soon to address the house on national affairs, tells the following story: "Some one asked Lovejoy what he thought of a certain speech (Seward's) noted for its conciliatory tone: 'We want,' said Lovejoy, 'no Melancthons now; we want Martin Luthers. We want no one to write essays upon the Union and the sin and disasters of secession, but some one to throw the inkstand right at the head of the Devil."

MICHIGAN STATE CONVENTION.—The Abolitionists of Michigan are invited to meet in Convention at Ann Arbor on Saturday and Sunday, the 26th and 27th inst. Parker Pillsbury, Josephine S. Griffing, Giles B. Stebbins, and other speakers will be present.

CHURCH ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.—We learn that there will be a Convention of the friends of the Church Anti-Slavery Society on Wednesday next, morning, afternoon and evening, at the Church of the Puritans. The Convention will be opened at 11 o'clock, a. m., with an address by Rev. Henry T. Cheever, and the afternoon and evening assemblies will be addressed by Rev. Messrs. Nathan Brown, Rev. J. R. W. Sloane, H. Mattison, C. H. A. Bulkley and others.

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

Receipts for The Standard from December 1, 1860, to January 1, 1861.

1089 E. Haskell, Foxcroft, Maine,	$1 00
1123 A. E. Stevens, Portland, Maine,	2 00
1084 Sarah P. R. Goodwin, Portsmouth, N. H.	2 00
1098 David Scott, Great Falls, "	1 00
1073 James Batchellor, Fitzwilliam, "	0 25
1124 Jos. Perry, Keene, "	2 00
1092 Miss Lodge, Boston, Mass.,	4 00
1126 W. I. Bowditch, Boston, Mass.,	2 00
1093 Miss Henrietta Sargent, Boston, Mass.,	2 00
1091 Azariah Smith, Middlefield, "	1 00
1126 Dr. Jno. B. Clarke, Fall River, "	2 00
1124 Phillip A. Chase, Lynn, "	2 00
1124 Charles T. Canf

Miscellaneous Department.

THE PRIVATE OF THE BUFFS.

BY SIR F. H. DOYLE.

"Some Seiks, and a private of the Buffs, having remained behind with the grog carts, fell into the hands of the Chinese. On the next morning they were brought before the authorities, and commanded to perform the *kotou*. The Seiks obeyed; but Moyse, the English soldier, declaring that he would not prostrate himself before any Chinaman alive, was immediately knocked upon the head, and his body thrown on a dunghill.—*China Correspondent of The London Time*

Last night, among his fellow roughs,
He jested, quaffed, and swore;
A drunken private of the Buffs,
Who never looked before.
To-day, beneath the foeman's frown,
He stands in Elgin's place,
Ambassador from Britain's crown,
And type of all her race.

Poor, reckless, rude, low-born, untaught,
Bewildered, and alone,
A heart, with English instinct fraught,
He yet can call his own.
Ay'e, tear his body limb from limb,
Bring cord, or axe, or flame:
He only knows, that not through *him*
Shall England come to shame.

Far Kentish hop-fields round him seem'd,
Like dreams, to come and go;
Bright leagues of cherry blossom gleam'd,
One sheet of living snow;
The smoke, above his father's door,
In gray soft eddyings hung:
Must he, then, watch it rise no more,
Doom'd by himself, so young?

Yes, honor calls! with strength like steel
He put the vision by.
Let dusky Indians whine and kneel:
An English lad must die.
And thus, with eyes that would not shrink,
With knee to man unbent,
Unfaltering on its dreadful brink,
To his red grave he went.

Vain, mightiest fleets, of iron framed;
Vain, those all-shattering guns;
Unless proud England keep, untamed,
The strong heart of her sons.
So, let his name through Europe ring—
A man of mean estate,
Who died, as firm as Sparta's king,
Because his soul was great.

—*Macmillan's Magazine.*

THE CONSERVATIVE.

A DISCOURSE,

Delivered in Cincinnati, December 16, 1860, *by*

M. D. CONWAY.

[Communicated for THE STANDARD.]

"I HAVE kept the faith," says Paul. I have not thought, in the course of these studies of Pauline Christianity, to vindicate him from the numerous animadversions and criticisms which the unreserved freedom of his life and speech has called upon him. Since the publication, by an old Anglican, of the work entitled, "Not Paul, but Jesus," there has been a perpetual muttering against the Apostle to the Gentiles. The Arminians do not like him, because he taught the doctrine of predestination in the Epistle to the Romans; the Judaizers did not and do not like him, because he classed the Sabbath day among heathen and unchristian festivals; the Radicals do not like him, because he did not hesitate to circumcise a youth after he had renounced Judaism; the Conservatives object that on Mars Hill he quoted the sentiment of a heathen Greek as sound Christianity; the social economists say that his views of marriage would be subversive of society. All these objectors have fixed upon one bold utterance of Paul as a fatal one to him; that, namely, in which he said, "I am made all things to all men." It is well known that Jesuitism took this sentiment, *Omnia omnibus*—all things to all men—as its motto; and that under it the Jesuit missionaries regarded themselves as warranted in all manner of temporizing, in fostering every error in order to make themselves acceptable and gain a foothold, where a plain avowal of their real views would at once have excluded them. Under the principle of "all things to all men," their missionaries dressed, it is said, as Confucian priests, and bowed to idols in China; and they are said to have recommended to the savage Indians the Savior of man as a great warrior who had in one day scalped ten thousand of his enemies. It is maintained that he is thus the father of the bad proverb, "In Rome do as Rome does"; and that his principle would make every man a truckler to the society in which he happened to be, dapper to circumstance, not outspoken; in short, Jesuitical.

It must be acknowledged, however, that Paul's life contradicts the interpretation thus put upon his words. Wherever he went he was regarded as a dangerous innovator. It is utterly inconsistent with the idea that he practised concealment and a time-serving policy, that he should have aroused more opposition than all the other apostles; that the Jewish Churches should regard him as too daring for them; that at Ephesus, when he came there, the makers of Diana's shrines and images should cry, "Our trade is in danger"; that at Athens he should be arrested as a setter forth of strange gods; that his own fellow-laborers, Peter and others, should have withstood him as too radical; that his friends, Demas and others whom he names, should forsake him, because he called them to too great sacrifices—all this is manifestly inconsistent with the idea that Paul was the apostle of a mean expediency. His history proves that, whatever may be meant by his being made all things to all men, he certainly did, under all trials, finish his course, and, under all exigencies, keep the faith. To my mind, his being made all things to all men has a glorious and transcendent significance. It means simply the working of the principle which we have before considered; that when a man takes his course of thought and belief, as it seems to him true, and, like Paul, *finishes* that course—carries it to its consistent results, evading none of its conclusions—that truth will be found in harmony with all other truths, wherever and whenever held. He must be a very stupid man who could believe that the various great religions of the world—the Hebrew, the Greek, the Oriental—were utterly and absolutely false, that they contained no truth whatever; that the grand old temples of ancient worship, reared through slow centuries out of the most sacred materials of the human heart, had not one stone in them but what was a lie. And when Paul found that the truth which he aspired to bear through the world found some related truth in all men and nations; when he could find Christianity under a Jewish rite or a Greek poem, so that he could, on such a point, be a Jew to Jews and a Greek to Greeks, it only proves that he took a larger and more universal view of his faith than those who could not see that religion was an essence under many higher or lower forms, and thought that God had revealed himself only to one single nation. Paul's being made all things to all men proves, then, exactly the opposite of the Jesuitical interpretation; proves that he had so finished his course, so attimated and developed his faith, which is the only way to keep it, that it brought him to a higher standpoint, from which he saw God as the Father of all men, Jew and Gentile, circumcision and uncircumcision, bond and free; also that all religions had been trained as branches, fitted for the grafting on of the loftier truth and life which Christianity offered each of them. He could thus appeal to Jews, *as Jews*, to accept the flower now blooming on their stem; to the Greeks, *as Greeks*, to receive a faith which harmonized with the insight of Cleanthes and Aratus, and fulfilled the recorded prophecies of Plato and Socrates. When Tyndal published his volume, "Christianity as old as the Creation," in which he traces the fundamental precepts of Christianity under all religions that ever existed, it was not supposed that he was a timid time-server who would bow to the superstitions of any country in which he happened to be; but rather that he was a brave man, who proved, by maintaining that Christendom did not monopolize God's favor—subjecting himself thereby to the charge of infidelity—that wherever he was, he would keep his faith, speaking the truth. So let us judge Paul.

"I have kept the faith," said Paul. Last Sunday we considered the Pilgrim's Progress; to-day we consider the Pilgrim's Conservatism. The true Christian is progressive; he is also conservative. To "conserve" is a Latin phrase, and means "to keep"; a genuine conservatism is to keep the faith. I say *genuine*, for we all know that there is a counterfeit conservatism trying to mix with our Christian currency. This spurious thing is that which would persuade men to hold on to the mere forms of faith; not to keep the faith, but the mere carcase of faith. If the faith goes into other forms, let it go, it says; our business is to hold on to the institutions, rites and ceremonies in which the faith once dwelt. This conservatism it is that builds the tombs of the prophets and garnishes their sepulchres; then goes out to stone the prophets who are not yet in their sepulchres. In the name of Washington it mobs freedom; in the name of Moses it crucifies Jesus, carrying out Moses's work; and in the name of Jesus it curses Luther and Parker, for keeping the faith he delivered and carrying on the work he inaugurated. To keep the faith is a very different thing from this; it is not a true conservatism to hold on to a soulless body until it grows putrid and sickens everybody in the house. There was a time when every creed and custom had a soul in it. Corrupt as it may be now, it once had a soul in it. This is literally true of everything. Once, perhaps, even slavery was a choice between murdering men or holding them in captivity; it was the merciful alternative of a barbarous state of society. But that which was once the choice of mercy, and so, having a soul, formed a patriarchal household about it, became a brutality and a corrupt system when a higher choice became possible. The same faith which preferred binding man to murdering him, now would have preferred liberating to binding him. A true conservatism would have held on to the faith, the humane spirit, under the new conditions; but the false conservatism, disguising selfishness, would hold on to the old form when it no longer covered mercy but inhumanity.

Remember, my friends, that I have determined, as well as I can, to translate the life of a true and noble man into the language of life as it exists about each man to-day. Paul is nothing to us, as he fights with beasts at Ephesus and outgrown idols throughout the world, back there in the ages; but the possible Paul in each of you—the apostle of humanity in each, who must, amid the beasts and idols and dangers of to-day, fight the good fight, and finish the course, and keep that faith handed down through the holy apostolic succession of earnest men, from age to age, from martyr to martyr; under all forms the faith which stands for humanity and truth. Ah, *he* is of an eternal and unutterable importance. Therefore it is that I must warn you of that which is popularly called conservatism to-day, that it is too often found self-deceived and deceiving others. If you would have the higher kind which would keep the faith, you shall find that it would lead you to many a needed reform. The laws preserved from ancient codes concerning woman, for another example, were once animated by the highest truth of their day; history marks them as signs of woman's elevation above the condition of a slave; but now millions of women groan under the code that was once her shield. It is appointed unto man to die, though we believe that his essence is immortal; equally is it appointed that the institutions which come out of men should die, whilst we know that the essence of them, the good in them, must be conserved and incarnate in higher institutions; and that all rules must be at length broken in the same spirit that made them—as the same laws of life which make a human form afterward bring it to decay.

Apply this to the creeds and Churches which claim to preserve the faith once delivered to the saints; to those who preserve in proud steeples, in marble and velvet, the old faith that once expelled its followers from the steeples and marble and velvet of synagogues and temples. The other day—a snowy, blustering, bleak day—I read an account of the death of a celebrated English bishop, who died a few weeks ago. He had a palace, an income larger than that of any man in this city, and more than threescore benefices under him. I looked up from the paper I was reading, looked out upon the bleak weather: a half clad, wayworn, anxious looking man passed hastily before the window, gathering his thin garments about him. Then I caught a glimpse of his half-turned face, and perceived that I was looking through a window of 1860 years, and the unsheltered man I saw. I need not name. Oh! royal bishop, is not this a more singular miracle than any you ever took to prove your Christianity—and I do not deny that it would take miracles to prove *some kinds* of Christianity—is not this, oh, princely diner on the flocks of which you were shepherd, a stupendous miracle, that the same faith that once gave its truest Teacher not even the home which the fox had in its hole and the bird in its nest, should build a marble palace for you? that the same doctrine of faith and truth which gave Paul a prison should declare a dividend of sixty-one benefices for you? Perhaps some of you will doubt whether the same faith could bear such different fruits. I must share your doubts. Yet do we not all know of a faith this day, stigmatized in the Churches which bear the name of the homeless and crucified One, a faith which the more we keep, a course which the more we finish, *does* bring us nearer and nearer to earthly losses and crucifixions? The same principles do not bear formally the same fruits in different ages; but they bear the same kind; those who keep the faith know that all Gethsemanes are not gardens in Palestine, nor all crosses made of wood. And there is a Pharisaism which frequents no synagogue, and yet may scourge Christ every day in its halls of wealth and respectability. Neither does it require thirty pieces of silver to make Judases, betraying the Lord whom they began to follow in the very hour of most need—giving up truth and justice to those who come with swords and staves to take them. All around us are the same old friends and foes with new faces. The first man encountered them, and the last man will encounter them. The figures on the papering of your wall, and on your carpet, are scrolls taken from the walls of ancient Thebes and Nineveh; and the every day duties and temptations amid which you move—a true or a false man or woman—are the same that were written on the cradle sides of the human race, and have stood on the right and left of it at every step of its history. Alike in the cross of Christ and the hemlock of Socrates eternal virtue marks her signet; whilst the Roman silver that buys Judas and the cotton bales that buy an American are the same filthy coin—the purchase of blood. The idolaters of Ephesus met Paul with no argument but the cry, "Our trade is in danger"; and the makers and worshippers at silver shrines still meet clear truth with the cry, "Our trade is in danger." And if there has been since then one step of genuine human progress, it must be traced, not in the growth of population, wealth or art, but in the ability of the human heart which once said, "Evil, be thou my good," now to say, "Get thee behind me, Satan!" And, in the face of the world, and of the superstitions and wrongs with which the world is dealing day by day, I declare that to be the true and the only true conservatism, which keeps the faith amid all emergencies; which, whatever else may go, will never let justice and honor go; which, like the old prophet, will stand firmly on the mount of God whilst the strong wind, and the fire, and the earthquake struggle by, awaiting "the still small voice" which shall remain when they have passed, still affirming the inviolable laws written by the finger of God on the tablets of the human heart.

No honor or profit or peace that your life can attain, my brother, can equal this, that you can cast a clear eye up to the recording angel of lives, and say with Paul, "I have kept the faith." All beings in their secret hearts honor and love the incorruptible man; and, though they applaud and vote for him, they despise the man of bad faith. To break the plighted faith, especially to break that which is plighted to the weak and wronged, is the last and deadliest crime with which man can flaunt the pure and equal heavens. It is a time to remember that there is in this universe a confederacy of God, governed by his unchangeable laws of right and wrong; and to this confederacy—before which high and low, rich and poor, weak and strong, are equal—every human heart is a sealed oath of allegiance. No man born in a human government has sworn to support it. He was not a party to its laws or its contracts; to break them may be treason to that government, but it may be loyalty to God. But in the higher confederacy it is otherwise; to see the right is to be pledged to it; every instinct, every sacred feeling of justice and sense of truth is the soul's kiss upon the Volume of God, and the man who does not keep the faith of his humanity and duty stands a perjurer and traitor before the bar of his own soul, and the divine tribunal of all souls, and the Father of all souls.

It is sad, it is painful, to see the vast multitudes of men wandering through the devious pathways of human life, without a sure guide. They are generally, I fear, like those who, in threading the windings of a cavern, should take no torch, but begin to measure with line and rule every step they are about to take; how many inches the pit is this side, how many the precipice that side; slowly they move on, absorbed in the one question of safety, and seeing none of the glories above and around. A single lamp, and they may throw aside their rulers; a single lamp, and each step is sure, and the pillars of strength and the star chambers catch and repeat the light and glorify alike columns and chasms. Amid all the questions and conflicts and vicissitudes of this world, how many lives are wasted in measuring and balancing duties and evils; when, if the heart did but keep its good faith alive and burning, it would be without fear or perturbation, finding in its own consciousness of integrity, an angel bearing it up, lest at any time the foot be dashed against a stone!

Come now, if a man cannot trust the truth of his own heart, what can he trust? In the times of trouble and peril a great many remedies and precautions are offered, but we have yet to hear of one that improves on each man's doing his duty! We have yet to find anything more honorable than honor, or juster than justice. And it will be time enough to think of framing other paths for men and nations, when our chemistry discovers something better than air for the lungs to breathe, and something better than light for the eye to see by. Till then, whatever bastard compromise of God's own right selfishness may wring from the violated soul, that soul will know, in the divine depths which ally her to him in whose image she is made, that each such base surrender breaks the faith it should keep, and that the lie which flatters to-day will scourge to-morrow. Trust not, I beseech you, that smiling plausibility which would lead you to tamper with the laws of simple rectitude; it is as the smile of the seducer on the woman he means to betray. There is a moral element in *all* the affairs of life, however much they seem to be matters of mere business or expediency, just as there is fire and electricity under the cold gray of a rock. And this element in affairs, wrongly treated, acts as a powder grain ignited at the heart of a rock. Gibraltar has stood the lashings of oceans for untold ages; but one little grain of powder could be so placed as to tear it to fragments. Fear not thou the waves and winds which beat from the world; but break the faith of thy own soul, and the world holds no safe shelter to hide thee.

THE TWO KINGS AT TEANO.

October 25, 1860.

Victor and Garibaldi, side by side—
The crowned King and the crownless—hand in hand,
'Neath the blue sky of their regenerate land,
Silent, mid shouting thousands, lo, they ride!
Not many royal hands so pure of guilt,
As to be laid within that stainless palm,
Horny with grasp of the familiar hilt;
Not many royal looks could brave the calm
Of those deep-seated and unwavering eyes,
Fearful or terrible, as ruth or war
Subdues or lights them. Ride on, to the cries.
Of "Long live Italy!" while, near and far,
All good men's hopes bless thine investiture,
Honest King-maker, of an honest King,
And pray thy work may stand, till rooted sure,
In spite of friends that as the ivy cling,
Stifling with wintry green, that shows like spring.
Ride on, Victor Emanuel, to the throne
From which crowned wickedness hath toppled down,
While Garibaldi, guerdonless, alone,
Takes his far higher throne and nobler crown!

—*Punch.*

THE SHAWL.

SEVENTY years ago, the word "shawl" held no place in the English language. The thing itself, the warm, convenient, comfortable, durable, and—worn by one who knows how to wear it—most graceful of feminine wrappers, was unknown in the realm of fashion when the great-grandmothers of the present generation moved therein. It is true that the negotiators sent by Tippoo Saib to the French government, when he was meditating that onslaught on the English which ended in his discomfiture and death, left behind them a few Cashmere shawls, as parting gifts to their Parisian acquaintances; but they were regarded as mere customary curiosities, and put not to their right use, but made to do duty as dressing-gowns and carpets! The ladies are indebted to one General Bonaparte for the beautiful addition to their toilet. His famous Egyptian expedition was the means of introducing the pride of the Indian loom into European society. No sooner had the shawl been adopted by Madame Emile Gaudin, the reigning Parisian beauty, than it became the rage. Two and three thousand francs were cheerfully paid for second-hand cashmeres, that had seen service as turbans on the heads of the Mogul soldiery, girded the supple waists of Bayaderes, or robed the persons of pagan priests; but, then, the excellence of the fabric, and the durability of the dyes, allowed them to be cleaned with impunity. However, as soon as the shawl was fairly established in popularity, the Levant traders took care there should be no lack of new ones, and a large trade was soon opened with India.

The shawl manufacture is supposed to have originated in the valley of Cashmere, but at what date is unknown; but ever since the first British factories were established in India, Cashmere shawls have constituted one of the most valuable branches of commerce. In the time of the Mogul empire, thirty thousand looms were kept busily occupied in Cashmere; under the Afghans, the number fell to eighteen thousand; and at the present time, six thousand looms are adequate to supply the demand for these beautiful products. This great falling off is attributable to many causes, among the most prominent of which were the destruction of the janizaries, and the fall of the dynasties of Cabul and Lucknow.

The material used in this important manufacture is the wool of a variety of the common goat (*Caprea hircus*), reared at an elevation of fourteen thousand feet above the level of the sea; the cold, dry tableland of Tibet being the only habitat in which the goat yields the peculiar soft wool required. Each goat yields annually about two pounds of woolly hair, half of which is kemp or coarse hair, used for counterpanes and carpets, the remainder being a beautiful, rich, and soft down, which, after being carefully separated from the kemp, fibre by fibre (an operation of such delicacy that one man or woman is occupied twelve hours in preparing one ounce of wool), is washed in rice starch, and sold at the rate of three rupees' weight for one rupee. There are two colors—one, ashy gray, which is usually woven in its natural hue; the other, white, which, of course, is easily dyed—a process jealously guarded by the Hindus, who desire to keep to themselves the secret of the harmonious hues which have baffled all imitators. There have long been established at Delhi and Lahore shawl manufactories under the direction of Cashmerians, but they have not succeeded in equalling the productions at head-quarters, especially in the fineness of the fabric, which the natives attribute to the quality of the water with which the vale of Cashmere is irrigated.

The gold and silver thread used in the embroidery, is chiefly made at Borhampoor, in the Deccan. A piece, purest ore, is beaten into a cylindrical form about the circumference of a thick reed; this is again beaten out in length till it will pass through a hole one-eighth of an inch in diameter; it is then drawn through gradually diminishing orifices, till it is reduced to the thickness of bobbin thread; and then wound on reels working on pivots, the ends being passed through still finer holes, and affixed to a large reel, which, being set in rapid motion, attenuates the threads still more. The next process is to flatten it on a steel anvil, and, by an ingenious process, cover a silk thread with the beaten-out metal, which thus forms a wire that will not tarnish. It is said that if a lump of silver be gilded before being drawn into wire, it will undergo the hammering, winding, and drawing out, and yet retain its gilding intact.

The Indian looms are of the rudest and most primitive description, the warp being supplied by two sticks, and the woof entirely worked in by hand—a slow and tedious process, but one that admits of an exactness and neatness of finish setting the rivalry of machinery at defiance. The weaver's wages are from three-halfpence to twopence a day—a wage to make one wonder at the value set upon Cashmere shawls, if we did not remember that as many as thirty, or even forty men will expend two years' labor upon a single shawl, and that before it reaches the purchaser, its price has been augmented fifty per cent. by taxation. The borders are made in several pieces, sometimes as many as twenty, and afterwards sewn together, so as to form the pattern. Every stitch being worked by hand, is distinct in itself, and may be pulled out without disturbing the remainder—an infallible test of the genuine Indian production.

Shawls are made of various textures, sizes, and forms, adapted to the several markets, the softest and most delicate being saved for export to Turkey. They are commonly made in two sizes, long and square, the first named measuring one hundred and twenty-six inches by fourty-four; the latter being from sixty-three to seventy-two inches square. From Cashmere alone there is exported annually an average value of 1,800,000 rupees; and there must be a considerable home demand for the shawls, which was at one time lessened by the importation of English goods, which at first found favor in the eyes of the natives, but sunk speedily in their estimation, when their quality was tested by actual wear. Of late years, the patterns have become more intricate and richer than ever. London is the great European mart, its dealers sending shawls to America, France, Russia, and Turkey in large quantities. China crape shawls, are made entirely of silk, the ground or foundation being manufactured at Nankin, and then forwarded to Canton, to have the pattern embroidered. This is done by two needlemen working together; one passes the silk downwards, while the other from below passes it up, a third workman changing the silk for them when necessary; but how the fastening on and off is performed, is a trade mystery yet preserved by the Chinese.

As a matter of course, the fair sex had not long joined the shawl movement, before British manufacturers attempted to produce something of the same sort—an attempt to which the high prices fetched by the Indian shawls was an irresistible inducement. The initiative was taken in this case by a Scotch tradeswoman, a Miss Bowie, who had long been engaged in the gold lace trade. By means of the sewing needle, and a material spun from the waste made in reeling the finest Italian silk, she made square shawls of simple patterns. Others, taking a hint from the mode of producing the patterns in damask, trained children to insert the colored yarn with their fingers; but the expense proved so great, that the experiment of thus imitating the works of Cashmere was speedily abandoned. Baffled, but not defeated, the men of Edinburgh still persevered. At length, that part of a loom called a "lay" was constructed and fitted up with boxes to hold the shuttles and colors required; this was managed by the application of the weaver's left thumb, so that without stopping his loom, he was able to throw in the colored yarn, and make it catch the threads of the warp as they were raised by the "draw-boy." A great waste of material was unfortunately unavoidable by this method, but still a man and two boys could produce as much work in a week as the Hindu could accomplish in twelve months. At first, the material employed was silk spun from waste, or mixed with the finest Saxony wool, worsted and cotton being used for the embroidery; but after Napoleon introduced the Tibet goat into France, its wool superseded all other materials. The shawls were sold at prices varying from two to ten guineas, and a good demand soon sprang up for them. Manufactories were established at Edinburgh, Norwich, Paisley, Glasgow, and Lyon. Jacquard's loom was afterwards adopted, and, for a time, France obtained the lead in the manufacture; but, eventually, the energy of the British manufacturers enabled them to beat their rivals, if not always in beauty of pattern, at any rate in price and quality. Glasgow and Paisley are now the principal seats of our home trade, which promises to be a permanent one; for while pelisses, scarfs, mantles and cloaks come in and go out again, the shawl is never out of date, but holds its own through all the mutations of fashion.—*Chambers's Journal.*

THE AMERICAN PULPIT.

[A few weeks since, WENDELL PHILLIPS spoke, on Sunday, from the pulpit left vacant by the death of THEODORE PARKER. The congregation having under consideration the question whether to give up or continue their Sunday exercises, Mr. Phillips took occasion to give his voice in favor of maintaining them. His remarks are thus sketched in the Boston *Traveller*:]

MR. PHILLIPS read a paragraph from an article written recently by Rev. Dr. Ellis, which he termed "An Apology for the Stupidity of the Pulpit," and which he adopted as a sort of text for his discourse. The paragraph exhibited the contrast between lyceum lecturing and preaching. Now, said the speaker, this is half true; but a half truth does often as much harm as a whole lie. It is not true that the lyceum owes its interest to the sparkling talk and lively rattle of its lecturers. It is not true that the pulpit owes its defeat to its being confined to sober truth. Here is an illustration near at hand. The Mercantile Library Association have for many years maintained a course of lectures, and for years it engaged the same men to occupy its platform, and its lecture course gave out. Yours, ("The Fraternity,") still lives, not because you have had better men, not because you have got more able men with more sparkling talk, not because Theodore Parker spent his life in this pulpit, but because you have brought here whatever was of interest; because you have presented here the truths which most affect humanity. It is this which gives interest to the pulpit. When we were children we didn't want to see an automaton more than twice. The second time we saw it, we found out we had seen the whole. Just so with the pulpit. When men recognize an automaton in it they don't go twice, unless they go from a motive of example and from an idea of sustaining religious institutions—as Coleridge said he found that four-fifths of the people who attended his preaching did so from a sense of duty to the other fifth. The speaker affirmed that he entertained no bitterness toward the pulpit. But while everything else progresses, this great means of education does not advance a bit; it does not make the life of the nation a part of itself. Ward Beecher said the other day that the anti-slavery enterprise was, in a manner, indebted to the Church. What a confession! No man who sits under a pulpit anywhere but here, thinks of learning his duty as a voter—upon women's rights for instance—one of the greatest moral questions of the day. You may attend upon ninety-nine out of a hundred pulpits, from here to New Orleans, and not hear a word about it. But I don't find fault with them. They do as well as they can. They perform their contract. The fault is not with the tenant of the pulpit. The fault is with that corrupt sentiment which belittles the pulpit. I affirm, in no bitterness of spirit, but as an American, and one interested in the machinery which is to control and direct the great future, that the pulpit of this country, tenanted as it is by some of the ablest and best educated men in the land, does not guide the intellect and thought of the country as it did in the early days of New England. It is true it has a momentous influence; it holds the people with a grasp of iron. But it is by fear. It has made men afraid to think. They look at it, and think that stupidity is Heaven. And having brought the people into this superstition, the pulpit broods over it like a nightmare. There are clergymen, it is true, who lead the public mind, but they do it through the press. They throw off their shackles when they appear in *The Christian Examiner* or *The North American*. The sin of this pulpit in Music Hall is that it promotes thinking.

Intellectual culture is very well, but it is not enough. With its advancement crimes of force disappear, but crimes of the intellect increase, and men cheat more on the Stock Exchange. The speaker then proceeded to discuss the character of priesthood. It is not possible that a class of men thus set apart shall know life, for they see but little of it. This society is based upon the early idea of Christian preaching. Men come here because they hear the truths of the time. They don't go to a caucus in Faneuil Hall for example's sake. A man goes there because his heart is there half an hour before he gets there. He goes because living men are there, to make his cradle safer. He goes because he hears the truth spoken in earnest. One earnest sentence will scatter all the "lively rattle" that ever came from all the lyceum lecturers in the world. In many of our New England towns the pulpit is simply an appendage of the factory. The minister is just as much employed by the owners to preach, as is the operative to spin. His intellect is all bought and paid for. And the lyceum came to cast out a devil; it is very natural for the pulpit to exclaim, "Lyceum lecturer, why dost thou torment me before my time?" We get an "able man" from Harvard College, with five languages and three philosophies, and tell him to preach Unitarianism, and if he preaches anything else he may go; and to preach the truth as he finds it in the Bible; not to find anything that *The Christian Examiner* don't indorse. The speaker closed his discourse with a very eloquent appeal for continued support for the society.

ALWAYS WITH US.

O CHARITY, of virtues first—
O holy prompting of the heart,
That bids us choose the better part,
But most in Heaven's mercy trust!

For mercy every night we pray!
We daily ask that Heaven's decree
May lightly fall on us, as we
Our duty to our fellows pay.

But in our daily life we see
Great Sin that stalks around us still,
And yet we show nor way nor will
To prove our Christian charity.

Shall fellow-creatures fall away,
And we put forth no hand to save
From death, and death beyond the grave,
God's images in kindred clay?

Like Cain, we ask that question still—
"Our brother's keeper how are we?"
And, though we murder not as he,
Our Abels by neglect we kill.

The city's alleys, foul and damp,
Show sights to give the angels awe—
Sad rebels 'gainst the Christian law,
Defacements of the Almighty stamp!

These are our sisters on the earth,
Our sisters in the world to come;
Yet our fraternal hearts are dumb,
And feel no pulse of foster-birth.

We shrug our shoulders when we meet,
Our garments gather lest we touch;
We will not own that any such
Are more than dust below our feet.

We mutter in 'side-whispered talk,
"How dreadful is this City's Sin!"
We—in our wealth of warmth within;
They—pacing wearily the walk,

With awful eyes, and hungry glare,
Still seeking what they may devour,
With more of horror in an hour
Than we in half a life could bear.

Whose is the greater sin—or ours,
Or theirs? We are not tried as they,
Whose living deaths from day to day
Make torture of those even hours,

Which gracious Heaven permits to glide
In quiet comfort o'er our heads,
Who, sleeping soft in downy beds,
Regard our easy lot with pride;

As if ourselves that lot had made,
Had gained it by our proper skill,
And Heaven had merely to fulfil
The claims consistent with our grade.

As if, assured of granted grace,
We knew our sins already shriven;
And, holding heritage in heaven,
But waited to assume our place.

Christians—of course—but all our years
Forgetful of our Saviour's law,
Who, when the Magdalen he saw,
Washing his feet with bitter tears,

Forgave her sin, and changed her lot,
And raised her up, and bade her go
In peace, and taught us all below
A lesson we have nigh forgot.

And, "always with us," still we find
These ever-present at our side,
Yet from our hearts the truth we hide,
That we and they are Christian-kind.

Ah, that his light would shine again,
To show us where our duty lies,
And wake compassion in our eyes
Like that which shone from his at Nain!

—*Temple Bar.* F. D. FINLAY.

IRA ALDRIDGE IN SCOTLAND.

THE Theatre Royal was reopened on Saturday night, when "Othello" was produced, Mr. Ira Aldridge, the African Roscius, taking the part of the Moor. We have had of late more than one proof of the intellectual excellence of the negro. We have had among us Dr. Delany, giving us the result of his explorations; and year by year the colored race are filling positions of honor in our Church courts, and on our platforms. Now a negro comes as a "star," and any one who saw his "Othello," on Saturday night, will not grudge him the distinctive appellation. It was a most intelligent, appreciative specimen of acting, and such as we have rarely seen beaten below Macready. Of course, he looked the character, and as a matter of fact, played it well, such as won for him the warmest applause and a "call." It is really refreshing to see the black man thus championed; to witness a man who would be put into the "negro pew" in an American church, prove high mental superiority by the brilliant success with which he renders Shakspeare. We are aware that Mr. Aldridge is in some respects a distinguished man; the more honor to him that he is in Britain disproving the Transatlantic theory of caste! Pity he cannot do so in New Orleans or even in New York! We shall be glad to see him in other characters, and can forgive much, if required, for the excellence of his "Othello."—*Glasgow Bulletin, Nov. 5th.*

A BRITISH FAST DURING THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

From Horace Walpole's Last Journals.

FEBRUARY 27, 1777.—The Fast was observed—a ridiculous solemnity, as the nation was to beg a blessing on their arms when the war was at an end—or at least suspended for sixteen months—if the Americans pleased. One passage in the appointed service was much remarked, as the whole nation seemed at once converted to pacific sentiments by Lord North's proposal. The words were these: "Then shall all the people say *after the minister*, Turn us, O Lord, and so shall we be turned!"

The following are poetical comments on the Fast:

A REFLECTION ON THE FAST.

[Composed while meditating on the following words of King David: "I will wash my hands in *innocency*; so will I approach thine altar."]

With *cruel hearts* and *bloody hands*
The *Ministry* were stained;
A Fast was published through these lands,
That they might all be cleaned.

But, oh, what blunders time affords!
Through want of grace and sense;
They washed them in a form of words
Instead of Innocence.

TENDERNESS FOR OPPONENTS.—Be tender to those that do not see as you see. For there are always blind men in the world. There are always men that, when the kingdom of God is right before them, do not see it. You must deal with such men tenderly. There are men that sit to this day, in their papers, and rail against abolition, and talk as if they had not lived a minute for the last thirty years—and they have not! Their life has not grown a particle in that time; they are bark-bound. If fifty stupid years were added to their life, they would be as diminutive in the end as now. They see nothing, and hear nothing, and understand nothing. Eyes they have, that they shall not see; ears they have, that they shall not hear; and a heart they have, that they shall not understand. Let us look upon them, therefore, as children of misfortune. Let us pity their blindness, their deafness, and their hardness of heart.—*H. W. Beecher.*

NEW SERIES OF TRACTS

PUBLISHED BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

AND TO BE OBTAINED AT THE

Anti-Slavery Offices, 5 Beekman street, New York; 107 Fifth street, Philadelphia; 15 Steuben street, Albany; and 221, Washington street, Boston.

No. 1. Correspondence between Lydia Maria Child and Governor Wise and Mrs. Mason, of Virginia. 5 cents.

No. 2 Victor Hugo on American Slavery, with letters of other distinguished individuals, viz., De Tocqueville, Mazzini, Humboldt, Lafayette, &c. 5 cents.

No. 3. An Account of some of the Principal Slave Insurrections during the last two Centuries. By JOSHUA COFFIN. 5 cents.

No. 4. The New Reign of Terror in the Slaveholding States, for 1859-'60. 10 cents.

No. 5. Daniel O'Connell on American Slavery; with other Irish Testimonies. 5 cents.

No. 6. The Right Way the Safe Way, proved by Emancipation in the West Indies and elsewhere. By L. MARIA CHILD. 10 cents.

No. 7. Testimonies of Capt. John Brown, at Harper's Ferry, with his Address to the Court. 2 cents.

No. 8. The Philosophy of the Abolition Movement. By WENDELL PHILLIPS. 5 cents.

No. 9. The Duty of Disobedience to the Fugitive Slave Act: An Appeal to the Legislature of Massachusetts. By L. MARIA CHILD. 5 cents.

No. 10. The Infidelity of Abolitionism. By WM. LLOYD GARRISON. 3 cents.

No. 11. Speech of John Hossack, convicted of a violation of the Fugitive Slave Act, at Chicago, Ill. 3 cents.

No. 12. The Patriarchal Institution, as described by Members of its Own Family. Compiled by L. MARIA CHILD. 5 cents.

No. 13. No Slave-Hunting in the Old Bay State: An Appeal to the People and Legislature of Massachusetts. 5 cents.

☞ A deduction of fifty per cent. will be made where a dozen or more copies are taken. Gratuitous copies will be sent by mail, for examination, on receiving the postage charge.

Philadelphia Advertisements.

EDWARD N. HALLOWELL,
COAL DEALER,
OFFICE,
133 WALNUT STREET, BELOW SECOND,
PHILADELPHIA.

HELPER'S "IMPENDING CRISIS" of the SOUTH can be had, wholesale and retail, at the Anti-Slavery Office, 107 North Fifth street, Philadelphia.

THE PUBLIC LIFE OF CAPT. JOHN BROWN, by James Redpath, with an Autobiography of his Childhood and Youth. For sale at the Anti-Slavery Office, 107 North Fifth street, Philadelphia.

BOARDING HOUSE.—Respectable persons can be accomodated with genteel boarding, transient or permanent, by applying to the subscriber, No. 822 South street, below Ninth, Philadelphia. WILLIAM STILL.

CARD.—ANNA M. LONGSHORE POTTS, M. D., Practising Physician, No. 661 North-Tenth street, Philadelphia, Pa. All cases in Medicine and Surgery treated with the most approved remedies, and most modern aids and appliances known to the science. Especial attention given to Obstetrics and diseases of women and children.

WM. HEACOCK'S FURNITURE WARE-ROOMS, No. 18 N. Ninth street, above Market, Philadelphia. Furniture made, repaired, varnished and upholstered. Mattresses made and repaired. Blinds, &c., put up and taken down. Removals and Packing of Furniture carefully attended to.

KENDERDINE & JUSTICE, Importers and Dealers in Foreign and Domestic HARDWARE, S. W. corner Spring Garden and Seventh streets, Phila. Constantly on hand a general assortment of hardware, cutlery, &c., at the lowest cash prices, Wholesale or retail. Particular attention paid to furnishing hardware for buildings.
JOSEPH R. KENDERDINE, WARNER JUSTICE.

PRIZE MEDAL awarded in London, in 1851, for his superiority over all others in the manufacture of Travelling Trunks; Carpet Bags, Valices, Gum Shoes, Coaches Hobby Horses and sole leather, steel spring, iron frame, iron-bound Trunks of all descriptions, of the best materials and workmanship. Black Leather Enamelled Bags, at the lowest prices.
THOS. W. MATTSON, Trunk Manufacturer,
130 Market street, S. W. corner Fourth, Philadelphia.

A LARGE assortment of SALAMANDER SAFES, of various sizes, always on hand, at No. 26 South Fourth street, Philadelphia. Warranted equal to any made in the United States. EVANS & WATSON, thankful for past favors, respectfully solicit a continuance of the same. Please give us a call before purchasing elsewhere. Patent slate-lined refrigerators, water filters, &c. A large assortment always on hand.
N. B. Sole agency for Butterworth's celebrated bank, vault and door locks. These locks bid defiance to all lock picks, Hobbs included.

CONFECTIONERY—REMOVAL.—Leatitia Bullock respectfully informs her friends and the public that she has removed to No. 152 North Sixth street, below Race, opposite the old stand, where she is prepared to furnish ice creams, water ices, jellies, cakes, candies, &c., of every description and of the best materials, all the produce of free labor, and warranted to give entire satisfaction. Parties and families furnished at shortest notice. Orders sent to any part of the city.

Equality to all! Uniformity of Prices! A new feature in Business. Every one his own Salesman.

JONES & Co., of the Crescent One Price Clothing Store, No. 200 Market street, above 6th, in addition to having the largest, most varied and fashionable stock of clothing in Philadelphia, made expressly for retail sales, have constituted every one his own salesman, by having marked in figures, on each article, the very lowest price it can be sold for, so they cannot possibly vary—all must buy alike. The goods are all well sponged and prepared and great pains taken with the making, so that all can buy